

# A D E F E N C E

Of a Late BOOK, Intituled,

*A Plain ACCOUNT of the Nature and End  
of the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper,*

I N

## R E P L Y

To the several ANSWERS to it,

*Dr. Brett, Dr. Warren, Mr. Bowyer, &c.*

WHEREIN THE

## N A T U R E, E N D,

AND

## I M P O R T A N C E

OF THAT

## S A C R A M E N T

Are clearly fet forth.

By THOMAS BUTTONSHAW, A. M.

RECTOR of *Addington* in KENT,

AND

Late of *Univerſity-College*, OXFORD.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for STEPHEN AUSTEN, at the *Angel* and  
*Bible* in *Newgate-Street*, and W. FLACTON at  
*Canterbury*. MDCCXLVII.



56 1/2

DEFENCE

OF A LATE BOOK

A Plain Account of the Nature and End  
of the Government of the East-India Company

# ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**HE Edition of the *Plain Account*  
made Use of in this *Defence*; and  
according to which it is quoted, is the  
Fourth Edition, which is something smaller  
than the First Edition.



SACRAMENT

Are clearly set forth.

By THOMAS BUTTOWSHAW, A.M.  
Rector of St. Andrew in Kent.

AND  
Late of University College, OXFORD.

LONDON

Printed for STEPHEN AUSTIN, at the Angel, and  
Bible in Newgate-Street, and W. FRASER at  
Cantabrigia. MDCCLXVII.

---

# THE P R E F A C E.

**I** Doubt not but the World will be surprised to see a Defence of The Plain Account of the Lord's Supper, come out so long after that Book was first published. One Reason of its not appearing sooner, is, that I waited some Time before I set about it, in Expectation of seeing it done by an abler Hand; another, the common Excuse of Want of Leisure. And as the Design of that Book, is, to set an important Institution of Christianity in its true Light; to teach what the peculiar Nature of it consists in, and what is the peculiar End of it; and to clear it from those Errors, which some have propagated concerning it, by making those Things to be Parts of the Nature and End of it, which are not peculiarly so, and thereby leading others into the

*Mistake, that they are so; and whereas, there have been several Answers to that Book, which, tho' they do not give a clear and satisfactory Confutation of it, do yet help to cause it to be misunderstood, and to binder the Truth therein contained from being so generally received, as otherwise it might be, and likewise to cause the Author of it to lay, in the Opinion of many People, under the Charge of having lessened the Privileges, and undervalued the Promises annexed by Christ to the Lord's Supper: to remove the Misapprehensions occasioned by those Answers, and to vindicate the Author from that Charge, is the Reason, that it now appears. And as to illustrate and support the Truth, and to defend the injured, are never out of Season; so I hope the following Work will not even now be judged unseasonable, tho' at so great a Distance of Time from the first Publication of that Book, of which it is a Defence.* 29 MR 59



# DEFENCE

Of the Plain Account, &c.

**H**AVING read the principal Answers TO THE PLAIN ACCOUNT OF THE NATURE AND END OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, and thinking the Arguments urged in them against the Doctrine taught in that Book not sufficient to confute it, I have here published to the World the Reasons for which I think so. In doing which my Design is to defend the general Doctrine delivered in that Book concerning the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper; and, if I succeed in this, I shall have answered my Design, tho' I should not defend every particular Argument, which the Author uses to prove that Doctrine. And in doing this I must begin, where the Adversaries of our Author begin, which is at the Title of his Book. The Title is this, A PLAIN ACCOUNT OF THE NATURE AND END OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

This, Dr. *Warren* says, “ is a very improper  
“ Title for his Book; and that it might have been  
“ more properly entitled, A Discourse to shew,  
“ That the Lord's Supper is not only improperly,  
“ but falsely called a SACRAMENT; because

## 2      *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ it is the main Intention of his Book to shew, that  
 “ the Lord’s Supper is not a Sacrament, as the  
 “ Word Sacrament is defined by our Church in  
 “ her Catechism and Articles. In the Catechism  
 “ it is declared, that *A Sacrament is an outward*  
 “ *and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace*  
 “ *given unto us, which outward Sign, is a Means of*  
 “ *our receiving the spiritual Grace, and a Pledge to*  
 “ *assure us thereof.* And in the 25th Article it is  
 “ declared, that *Sacraments ordained of Christ be*  
 “ *not only Badges and Tokens of Christian Men’s*  
 “ *Profession, but rather they be certain sure Wit-*  
 “ *nesses and effectual Signs of Grace, and God’s*  
 “ *good Will towards us, by the which, that is, by*  
 “ which Sacraments, “ *he doth work invisibly in*  
 “ *us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen*  
 “ *and confirm our Faith in Him.* Now directly  
 “ contrary to this, says Dr. Warren, it is the  
 “ only Purpose of your Book to shew, that the  
 “ partaking of the Symbols of Bread and Wine in  
 “ the Lord’s Supper is no more than a Badge or  
 “ Token of the Christian Profession, and tho’ it  
 “ be done in an honourable Remembrance of *Christ*,  
 “ it amounts to no more, than an Acknowledge-  
 “ ment of him for our Master, is no particular  
 “ Means of Divine Grace and spiritual Strength,  
 “ conveys no extraordinary beneficial Influences to  
 “ the worthy Receiver, is attended with *no Grace,*  
 “ *by which God works invisibly in us,* nor indeed  
 “ with any Impressions or Influences whatsoever. ”

With regard to which Charge of the Dr’s I  
 must observe first, That by those Words cited out  
 of the 25th Article, *Grace by which God works*  
*invisibly in us,* the Dr. insinuates the Sense of the  
 Article to be, that *God works invisibly in us by the*  
*Grace,* of which the Sacraments are Means of our  
 receiving: but the Sense of the Article is, that *God*

*works invisibly in us by the Sacraments, as is very evident to any one, who looks into the Latin Article, where it is expressed thus, efficacia. Signa Gratiae, atque bonæ in nos Voluntatis Dei, per quæ invisibiliter ipse in nos operatur.*

Having observed this, I affirm in direct Contradiction to the Dr. that our Author has declared in his Book Pag. 169. 170. that the Lord's Supper is an outward visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace, i. e. *Favour or Mercy*, given unto us; an outward Sign ordained by *Christ* Himself; that it is a Means of our receiving this inward and spiritual Grace, or *Favour and Mercy*; that by it, *viz.* the Lord's Supper, God works invisibly in us; and that it is a Pledge to assure us of this inward and spiritual Grace, to assure us that God hath given this *Favour and Mercy* to us.

The Lord's Supper is an outward and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace given unto us of God, as the Bread and Wine therein are the Signs of the Body and Blood of *Christ* given and shed for our spiritual Advantage and Benefit; for the sake of which Body and Blood given and shed God was pleased to grant us many spiritual Favours and Benefits; of which Benefits the Bread and Wine are a Sign, as they are the Signs of *Christ's* Body given and Blood shed, for the sake of which the great spiritual Grace of granting us those Benefits was given.

That our Church in its Definition of a Sacrament means by an *inward and spiritual Grace* an inward and spiritual *Favour and Mercy*, and not particularly and solely the *Holy Ghost*, or the *Influence and Assistance* of it, is manifest: First because it explains the Word *Grace* in this Sense in the 25th Article by the Addition of those Words *and God's good will towards us.* For the Words *God's good*



#### 4 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Will towards us* do not signify any thing different from or additional to what the Word *Grace* signifies; but they both signify the same Thing. The *Holy Ghost*, or the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it, is one Part of God's good Will towards us, and no Reason can be given, why the Church should particularly mention only this Part of it, as she has done, if *Grace* signifies only the *Holy Ghost*, or the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it. Besides if the Church had intended the Word *Grace* in this Sense, she should have expressed herself thus, of *Grace and the rest of God's good Will towards us*. For, according to the Manner, in which it is expressed, the Words imply, That *Grace* either signifies the same with *God's good Will towards us*, or something entirely distinct from it; and then in the latter Case it cannot signify the *Holy Ghost*, or the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it, that being included in *God's good Will towards us*.

Secondly, That by *Grace* the Church means a *Favour* or *Mercy*, and not particularly and solely the *Holy Ghost*, or the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it, is farther evident from its Definition of a Sacrament in the Catechism. There the Word *Grace* only is used to express what a Sacrament is the outward and visible Sign of. And if by *Grace* be meant particularly and solely the *Holy Ghost*, or the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it, then, according to this Definition, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, which are the *outward and visible Sign* therein, are the Signs only of the *Holy Ghost*, or of the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it. But it is certain, that the Bread and Wine are the Signs of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, broken and shed for Mankind. And they are by the Church expressly declared to be so in the following Questions and Answers, where she says, That the Body and Blood of  
*Christ*

## of the LORD'S SUPPER.

5

*Christ* are the *inward Part*, or *Thing signified* in the Lord's Supper, by the Bread and Wine, the *outward Part* or *Sign of it*. And the Bread and Wine by being the Signs of the Body and Blood of *Christ* broken and shed for Mankind are the Signs not only of the *Holy Ghost*, or of the *Influence* and *Assistance* of it, but of the whole Favour and Mercy of the Gospel Covenant, which was granted to us for the sake of *Christ's* Body broken and his Blood shed. And this Sense of the Word *Grace*, to signify a *Favour* or *Mercy* or *good Will*, is very common both in Scripture, and the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, if not the only Sense of it.

The Lord's Supper is a Means of our receiving that inward and spiritual Grace, that is, those spiritual Advantages and Benefits given us for the sake of *Christ's* Death, as it tends to keep us in the Profession and Practice of the Christian Religion, Pag. 145. of our Author; as it leads and helps us to such Thoughts, as may confirm us in that universal Obedience, which is the Condition, upon which those Benefits are granted, and God works invisibly in us by the Lord's Supper, as by its natural Tendency he helps and leads us thereby to that Obedience.

When I say, That God works *invisibly* in us by the Lord's Supper, as by its natural Tendency he helps and leads us thereby to an universal Obedience, I do not intend to affirm, That God does not assist us with the Holy Ghost in the Use of the Lord's Supper, that by it we may be helped and led to that Obedience to which it has a natural Tendency to help and lead us; or that he may not reward our Obedience in this particular Instance by giving us greater Degrees of his Holy Spirit. There can be no Doubt, but that God does assist us with his Spirit in the Performance of this *instrumental* Duty.

## 6 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

as well as in the Performance of any other, as *Consideration, Watchfulness, Fasting,* and others, that they may beget in us that Holiness, which they have a natural Tendency to do; or, but that he may reward our Obedience in this particular Instance, as well as in any other, with farther Degrees of his Holy Spirit. But I intend to affirm thereby, That God does not work *invisibly* in us by the Lord's Supper, as that is *peculiarly* ordained as a Means of conveying to us the Holy Ghost; or as it is a Means of our receiving the Holy Ghost at and by the very Act of receiving it; or as thereat or thereby there is any necessary Effect and Operation of the Holy Ghost upon *Christians*, or any Sort of Operation of Him other than his Concurrence with their own voluntary Endeavours, as at any other Time, and in the Performance of any other Duty; and that God no otherwise works *invisibly* in us by the Lord's Supper, as it is a Sacrament, than as by *the outward visible Sign* therein it has a natural Tendency to help and lead us to Holiness. For his Workings in us by the Holy Ghost thereat are common to that with other Duties.

The Lord's Supper is a Pledge of that inward and spiritual Grace, as the Bread and Wine are appointed to be eaten and drunk as Signs to keep us in Remembrance of the Death of *Christ*, which he suffered to procure for us those Benefits. For we cannot duly partake of the outward visible Bread and Wine in Remembrance of *Christ* and his Death, for the sake of which those Benefits are given to us, and by consequence in Remembrance of those Benefits also, without an Assurance that such Benefits are granted.

That our Author teaches the Lord's Supper is thus an outward visible Sign of an inward and  
spiritual



spiritual Grace given unto us, ordained by *Christ*, Himself, as a Means whereby we receive the same and a Pledge to assure us thereof, is evident to any one, who reads his Book. He does not indeed teach, that it is a Means of our receiving this spiritual Grace at and by the very Act of receiving it, by any *Physical* or *instantaneous* Operation; but does indeed deny it: and if any think this or any Thing more, than our Author has taught, to be necessary towards the Lord's Supper's being a Sacrament according to the Definition of our Church, they would do well to prove it, both that more is required by that Definition, and that the Lord's Supper is attended with any other Impressions and Influences, or does in any other Manner convey them.

Dr. *Warren* says, " that our Author in shewing, that the Sense of the Word Sacrament, as explained by the Church, is consistent with that Notion of the Lord's Supper, which he maintains thro' his Book, has by subtle Distinctions evaded the most plain Words, and most clear and express Decisions. " And Pag. 7. " A plain Man, who is not well versed in this Art, would be apt to think, that our Church in the Words of the Definition of a Sacrament must be understood to mean, that in the Lord's Supper there are two Things received, one outward and visible, and the other inward and spiritual. " But if a Man was so plain as to think, that our Church must be understood to mean, that in the Lord's Supper the outward and visible Thing, and the inward and spiritual one were received at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper, he would be plainly mistaken; both because it is not necessary so to understand our Church, and because

## 8 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

ing to the Terms of the Gospel it is impossible to be true. The outward and visible Sign is indeed received at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper; but the inward and spiritual Grace, meaning thereby the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, is not by any Grace or Virtue annexed to the material Elements received along with them at and by the very Act of receiving them, neither is it possible for them to be so received according to the Terms, of the Gospel, as will be shewn hereafter <sup>a</sup>.

“ But, says the Dr. the Meaning of the Church  
 “ in the Definition of a Sacrament is still more  
 “ evident from what follows in the Catechism.  
 “ For when the Terms of the general Definition  
 “ are afterwards explained by an Application to  
 “ Baptism and the Lord's Supper; it is said of one,  
 “ The Grace conferred is *A Death unto Sin, and*  
 “ *a new Birth unto Righteousness*, and of the other,  
 “ that *the Body and Blood of Christ are so verily and*  
 “ *indeed taken by the Faithful*, that they have *their*  
 “ *Souls strengthened and refreshed* thereby, even as  
 “ their Bodies are by the Bread and Wine. ” But  
 the Church only says, that *A Death unto Sin, and*  
*a new Birth unto Righteousness* is the inward and  
 spiritual Grace in Baptism, not that it is conferred  
 at and by the very Act of baptizing. *A Death*  
*unto Sin, and a new Birth unto Righteousness* signi-  
 fy to forsake Sin and practice Righteousness; but  
 these are not actually conferred at and by the very  
 Act of baptizing. No Person is caused actually to  
 forsake Sin and practice Righteousness at and by  
 the very Act of baptizing any farther, than as he  
 is moved afterwards to it from a Sense of the Ob-  
 ligation, which at his Baptism he entered into to  
 do so; or as he is by Baptism admitted to the Be-  
 nefits

<sup>a</sup> See under Prop. viii.

nefits and Privileges of the Gospel, and so receives the Holy Ghost, so as to be enabled to do it, if he be not wanting to himself. Neither is it the Sense of the Church, that *The Body and Blood of Christ are so verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper* by their receiving therein the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as that they, those Benefits, are received at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper, and conveyed along with the material Elements; because this is impossible according to the Terms of the Gospel, as shall be hereafter shewn; <sup>b</sup> as it will also, that by *taking and receiving the Body and Blood of Christ* in this Answer it is most probable the Church means not to receive all the Benefits of his Death, but to believe in Him <sup>c</sup>.

Having thus answered Dr. Warren's Objection against the Title, which our Author hath given to his Book, I shall now proceed to answer, what is objected to the Doctrine delivered in the Book itself. And in doing this I shall observe the following Method, first set down our Author's Propositions, and then consider the Objections made to each of them, and to what is said to illustrate and support them.

## PROPOSITIONS.

- I. The Partaking of the *Lord's Supper* is not a Duty of itself; or a Duty apparent to us from the Nature of Things: but a Duty made such to *Christians* by the positive Institution of *Jesus Christ*.
- II. All *Positive Duties*, or Duties made such by *Institution* alone, depend entirely upon the Will

<sup>b</sup> See under Prop. viii.

<sup>c</sup> Under Prop. xvii.



Will and Declaration of the Person, who institutes and ordains them, with respect to the real *Design* and *End* of them; and consequently to the due *Manner* of performing them.

III. It is plain therefore, that the *Nature*, the *Design*, and the Due *Manner* of partaking, of the *Lord's Supper*, must of necessity depend upon what *Jesus Christ*, who instituted it, hath declared about it.

IV. It cannot be doubted that he himself *sufficiently* declared, to his first and immediate Followers, the whole of what he designed should be understood by it, or implied in it.

To these four Propositions nothing is objected; only Dr. *Warren* says Pag. 13. that he admits them as true with this Restriction; That by “*Manner of performing a Positive Duty* mentioned “*Prop. 2.* and by *Manner of partaking of the* “*Lord's Supper*, mentioned *Prop. 3.* which our “*Author* says, *depends entirely upon the Declaration* “*of the Institutor*, is meant only the *Manner* of “*performing the Duty* with regard to all the Parts “*of the sacred Action* itself, such as the *breaking* “*and eating Bread*, and *drinking Wine*, in *Remem-* “*brance of Christ*, and not with regard to the “*Temper and Sentiments and Dispositions* of “*those, who partake of the Lord's Supper.* “Which Restriction I admit of, if by *all the Parts of the sacred Action* be meant *all the outward and corporeal Acts* necessary to the Due Performance of this Duty.

V. It is of small Importance, therefore, to *Christians*, to know what the many Writers upon this Subject since the Time of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles* have affirmed. Much less can it be the Duty of *Christians* to be guided

guided by what any Persons, by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations, may teach concerning this Duty.

To this Proposition Dr. *Brett* objects, That the  
 “ plain Design of it is to persuade his Readers,  
 “ that whatever even the most antient Fathers,  
 “ even they, who were the immediate Disciples of  
 “ the Evangelists and Apostles, have said, is not  
 “ to be regarded. Nay, that it looks, as if he  
 “ would have them read, and by consequence re-  
 “ gard, no other Author, who has treated of this  
 “ Subject, but himself. “

To which I reply, First, that the plain Design of this Proposition seems to be, to persuade Persons not to regard that, which any Writers have affirmed concerning this Duty, which they teach, by *their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations*. For to any one, who attentively reads this Proposition, The Sense of it will appear to be, *That it is of small Importance to Christians to know those Things, which the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Time of the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirmed concerning this Sacrament by their own Authority and from their own Imaginations only, without any Foundation in Scripture*. And this Proposition I think no one can find Fault with or deny. And that this is the Sense of the Proposition will appear from comparing together the two Sentences of which it consists. For *what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Time of the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirmed*, in the first Sentence, signifies the same as *what any Persons by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations, may teach concerning this Duty*, in the latter. These two Sentences are connected with each other, and the latter is a Consequence of the former. It is of small Importance, says our Author,

Author, to *Christians* to know what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Time of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles* have affirmed. And then he goes on to infer, arguing a *Minore*, since it is but of small Importance to *Christians* to know, much less therefore can it be their Duty to be guided by, to practice and act according to, what those many Writers have affirmed, those, who, as it is explained in the following Words, have by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations, taught any Thing concerning this Duty. He does not say, that it is absolutely of no Importance at all to *Christians* to know those groundless Doctrines; to know them might do Persons no Hurt, if it did them no good; nay, it might prevent their falling into the Errors, they teach; or their knowing and considering of them beforehand might the better enable them to confute those Doctrines, should they at any Time fall into an accidental Controversy concerning them. But if it be of small Importance to *Christians* to know those Doctrines, which any Persons by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations, may teach concerning this Sacrament, it follows very strongly, that it cannot be their Duty to be guided by or act according to them; for whatsoever a Person is obliged to act according to, or practice, that it is of great Importance for him to know.

And as this appears to be the Sense of the Proposition from the Consideration of it taken by itself, so does it also from what our Author says after it. He first gives a Reason to prove the Proposition to be true; and then from that Reason concludes thus, “ All that is added therefore, to “ *Christ’s* Institution, as a necessary Part of it, ought “ to be esteemed only as the *Invention* of those “ who add it. “ Which Conclusion contains the Sense



Sense of the foregoing Proposition, being drawn from the Argument, which is brought to prove it; and plainly shews, that what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Times of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, have affirmed, which he says it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know, is, what they have added by their own Authority or Invention. This Sense of the Proposition is farther confirmed by what our Author says in the next Paragraph, That " he is the more solicitous to observe this, " that is, what he affirms in this Proposition, — " because it is the only Thing, " that can either prevent, or cure, the Mistakes " and Uneasiness of many sincere *Christians* upon " this Subject: it being very certain, that they " are owing to the Account given of this religious " Duty, in many Books of Devotion; and not " to the *original Account* of it, laid down in the " *New Testament*. " From whence it appears, That what he says in this Proposition it is of small Importance for *Christians* to know, is the *Accounts* given of this Duty, in many Books of Devotion, which are not founded in the *original Account* of it, laid down in the *New Testament*.

Secondly, That our Author in this Proposition does not seem to mean those antient Fathers, who were the immediate Disciples of the Evangelists and Apostles, in the two or three first Centuries. For the Persons meant by him are *the many Writers upon this Subject*; they, who have wrote whole Treatises on Purpose upon it, which the most antient Fathers did not, but only mention it occasionally. So that the Writers meant by our Author in this Proposition seem to be those of a later Date. And this is confirmed from the Words above cited at the latter End of our Author's Remarks after this Proposition; by which it appears That

That the *Writers*, intended by him in it, are the *Writers* of those *Books of Devotion*, to whose Accounts of this Duty given in them the Mistakes and Uneasiness of many sincere *Christians* upon this Subject are owing; which *Writers* were not those primitive Fathers, who were the immediate Disciples of the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, nor those of the two or three first Centuries; but those of a later Date.

And hence it appears, That it is not the plain Design of this Proposition to persuade his Readers, That whatever even the most ancient Fathers, even those who were the immediate Disciples of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, have said, is not to be regarded; and That neither does it look, as if he would have them read no other Author, who has treated on this Subject, but himself. For tho' it be of small Importance to *Christians* to know, what the many *Writers* upon this Subject, since the Times of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, have affirmed by their own Authority, or from their own Imagination, concerning this Duty, without any Foundation in Scripture; yet it may be of Importance to *Christians* to know, what other *Writers* have affirmed concerning it besides himself; what they have affirmed, who teach nothing concerning this Duty, but what may be proved from the Passages of the *New Testament* relating to it, fairly and plainly and naturally interpreted, and do not run out into Imaginations and Conceits, which cannot be proved from those Passages. And our Author may be careful to observe the *Canons* of that Church, of which he is a Priest, and actually observe them, and teach his Parishioners, and endeavour to persuade the Nation notwithstanding, that it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know, what the many *Writers* upon this Subject, since the Times of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, have

of the LORD'S SUPPER. 15

have affirmed, by their own Authority and from their own Imaginations, without any Authority from Scripture.

To this Proposition Dr. *Warren* objects, " That  
" our Author seems to make it an Inference from  
" the preceding Propositions; but that it is not  
" so. " But certainly, if the Nature, the Design and  
due manner of partaking of the Lord's Supper  
depend upon what *Jesus Christ* himself declared  
about it, and he sufficiently declared the whole,  
of what he designed should be understood by it  
and implied in it, either by himself or his *Apostles*,  
it must be of small Importance to *Christians* to  
know, what the many Writers upon this Subject,  
since the Times of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*,  
have taught concerning this Duty, by their own  
Authority, or from their own Imaginations. Be-  
cause without knowing that, *Christians* may know,  
what *Christ* designed should be understood by and  
implied in the Lord's Supper; and it is of no Im-  
portance to them to know more.

No, says Dr. *Warren*, Page 16. this is not  
sufficient; for " contentious Men are often wont  
" to make Difficulties, where there really are  
" none, and, by their perverse Disputings, to per-  
" plex Matters, in themselves sufficiently plain,  
" only to serve some darling Lust, or favourite  
" Opinion, whereby it happens, that in short De-  
" scriptions of a Rite or Duty Contentions may  
" arise about the Meaning of them, and a Dust  
" be raised sufficient to render the Discernment of  
" the Truth obscure and dubious. Now in this  
" Case surely an Appeal to the Opinion and  
" Practice of those, who conversed with the  
" Writers of the Holy Scriptures, or their im-  
" mediate Disciples and Followers, is highly just  
" and reasonable, in order to fixing the Sense of  
any



## 16 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ any particular Passages, concerning which  
 “ Questions have been moved.

I confess, that in this Case an Appeal to such Persons, as the Dr. mentions, is highly (just and reasonable; neither does our Author in this Proposition affirm the contrary by saying, That it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Times of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, have taught concerning this Duty by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations; what those Writers have affirmed, who are of a later Date, than they, *who conversed with the Writers of the Holy Scriptures, or their immediate Disciples and Followers*. But in the present Case, if we should appeal to the Opinion and Practice of those, who conversed with the Writers of the Holy Scriptures, or their immediate Disciples and Followers, it will be of no Signification. For it does not appear from their Writings, that they taught or did any Thing, from whence it can be inferred, that the Sense of the Passages of Scripture, concerning the Lord's Supper, is different from that of our Author, or agrees with that of his Adversaries; or that the one is condemned, and the other confirmed, by the *united Suffrage* of those Persons; as will appear more fully hereafter.

Mr. Bowyer makes the same Objection to this Proposition Pag. 3. and, to prove the Importance of having Recourse to the Fathers to determine the Sense of the Passages of Scripture relating to the Lord's Supper, he asks, “ How we could  
 “ know, that our Saviour is not to be understood  
 “ literally in the xiii. Chap. of St. *John*, where  
 “ he says, *Ye ought also to wash one another's*  
 “ *Feet: For I have given you an Example that ye*  
 “ *should do as I have done unto you without*  
 “ having

“ having Recourse to the Judgment and Practice  
“ of the primitive Church? ”

To which I answer first, That it is sufficiently plain from the Context, that *Christ* is not to be understood literally in that Place.

Secondly, I confess, that the figurative Sense of that Passage is confirmed by the Judgment of the primitive Church, declared by their Practice, which has plainly been universal not to obey that Precept in the literal Sense. And did it as plainly appear by the Writings and Practice of the primitive Church, that they understood the Passages of Scripture relating to the Lord's Supper in a Sense different from that of our Author, or agreeing with that of his Adversaries, it would weaken the one, and confirm the other: but this doth not appear.

Pag. 20. Dr. *Warren* says, that there is no Manner of Force in our Author's Reasons for the Defence of this Proposition; because “ altho’  
“ it is undoubtedly true, that in a Matter of  
“ arbitrary Institution, the Person instituting is  
“ the only Judge of his own Meaning; and altho’  
“ it will from thence follow, that if he has not  
“ plainly made known his Mind concerning what  
“ he has instituted, ’twill be impossible for any  
“ one else to supply that Defect; ——— which  
“ are the Reasons of our Author, ——— yet  
“ what is this to the Purpose of shewing the  
“ primitive Writers of the Church to be improper  
“ Witnesses of the true Design of the *Apostles*  
“ in the Declarations made by them concerning  
“ this Rite, and the Nature, Use and Benefits of  
“ it? ” Nothing at all; neither does our Author bring these Reasons to shew, that the primitive Writers of the Church are improper Witnesses of the true Design of the *Apostles*, in the Declarations made

by them, concerning the Lord's Supper: but he brings them to prove, That it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know, what any Persons have added to this Rite by their own *Invention*, and without any Foundation in the *Declarations* made by the *Apostles* concerning it, or that there is little or no Occasion for the Testimony of the primitive Writers, if he intends the primitive Writers at all in this Proposition, and by consequence that it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know their Testimony concerning the Matter, to shew the true Design of the Apostles, in the Declarations made by them concerning the Lord's Supper: because that their Design is sufficiently plain from those Declarations themselves, compared with each other. To which I shall add with regard particularly to the present Controversy concerning the Lord's Supper, That it does not appear from the Testimony of the primitive Church, that the true Design of the Apostles in their Declarations concerning the Lord's Supper favours the side of our Author less than that of his Adversaries; as they either do not plainly declare this, or do not agree in their Testimony.

Pag. 21. the Dr. mentions the Difference between our Author and others in their Sentiments concerning the Design and Effects of the Lord's Supper; though he represents the Sentiments of our Author entirely wrong, as will appear hereafter; and then he says, " Now upon so wide a  
 " Difference in the Sentiments of Men concerning  
 " the Design and Effects of this Duty, where both  
 " alike alledge the same Holy Scripture in Support  
 " of their opposite Opinions, what can a plain  
 " honest *Christian* do in the Case, but, after due  
 " Examination of the Pretences and Allegations  
 " on both sides, inquire what the first Writers  
 " of the Christian Church have declared upon the  
 Point



“ Point, and embrace that, for the real Sense  
 “ of Scripture, which is vouched for by the  
 “ united Suffrages of all those Writers, who,  
 “ from their Proximity to the Times of the  
 “ Apostles, may be justly thought capable of  
 “ best knowing the true Sense of their Declarati-  
 “ ons concerning this Matter. ”

What our Author says in this Proposition does not appear to contradict this. But if a plain honest *Christian* was to inquire never so much what the first Writers of the Christian Church have declared upon the Point, he would not be able to find out the real Sense of Scripture concerning the *Lord's Supper*, nor know the Design and Effects of it, so well, as by examining and consulting the Scriptures themselves, and believing that to be the Design and Effects of it, which is plainly declared to be so in Scripture, or which naturally follows from what is there plainly declared concerning this Duty; and that for the Reason just above mentioned.

To this Proposition, and to what is said immediately after the next, the *Sacrament of the Altar* objects, that our Author allows, “ that  
 “ they, who were instructed by the Apostles,  
 “ were fully instructed in the Nature of this  
 “ Institution; and yet, in contradiction to him-  
 “ self, he asserts, that it is of *small Importance* to  
 “ Christians to know, what they have said in  
 “ this Matter. I say, in *Contradiction to him-*  
 “ *self*; for how can it possibly be of small Im-  
 “ portance to know, what those Writers have  
 “ said about this Ordinance, who were fully  
 “ instructed by the Apostles themselves in the  
 “ Nature of it? ” But in this Proposition our Author appears not to say *universally*, That it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know what  
 C 2 those

20 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

those Writers have said about this Ordinance, who were fully instructed by the Apostles themselves in the Nature of it: but only, that it is of small Importance to *Christians* to know what any Writers have affirmed concerning it by their own Authority, and from their own Imagination without any Foundation in Scripture.

The *Sacrament of the Altar* goes on, " On the contrary, in the Reason and Nature of of Things, are not the Accounts, which we have from those Writers of this Institution, the best, or rather, the only Means to let us into the full Sense and Meaning of those Accounts, which the Writers of the New Testament have left us? " To which I answer No: but to consult these Accounts themselves, and to compare them with each other, and with other Passages of Scripture, is a *Means*, and as good a *Means* as any, to let us into the full Sense and Meaning of them.

Secondly, *in the Reason and Nature of Things* it is only probable, that the Accounts, which we have from those Writers, of this Institution, are good Means to let us into the full Sense and Meaning of those Accounts which the Writers of the New Testament have left us; but not that they certainly are so.

Thirdly, If those Writers have given *true* Accounts of this Institution, and have neither added to, nor diminished from, what is contained in those Accounts of it, which the Writers of the New Testament have left us, and their Accounts be also as plain and intelligible, as the Accounts given by the Writers of the New Testament, then are the Accounts of those Writers good Means to let us into the full Sense and Meaning of the Accounts of the Writers of the New Testament.

Testament. But whether the Accounts of those Writers be such, can be known only, by comparing them with, and examining them by the Accounts, which the Writers of the New Testament have left us concerning this Institution.

The *Sacrament of the Altar* goes on Pag. 4. " But our Author sets aside all other Writers, " *antient* as well as modern, whether they wrote " *sooner* or *later* after the Apostles, and affirms " it to be of *small Importance*, to know what " they have said concerning this Matter; because, " says he, *a few Years make a great Alteration* " *in Men's Notions and Language about such* " *Points of Religion.* " But I have shewn, that it does not appear, that our Author in this Proposition intends *Universally* to set aside all other Writers, *antient*, as well as modern. And the Reason here cited from him after his sixth Proposition is not given by him to prove that it is of *small Importance* to know, what all other Writers after the Apostles have said concerning this Matter: but to prove, that the Writers of the New Testament are the *best*, or rather the only Writers for us to depend upon. Not so indeed, as that no regard at all is to be paid to any other Writers whatsoever; but that " Others, who " followed, whether *sooner* or *later*, have no " Pretences to the same regard from us." A Proposition, the Truth of which, I believe, this Author will not venture to contest.

This Author goes on, " It cannot, with any " Manner of Reason, be affirmed, that the first " and earliest Writers of Christianity, some of " whom, as *Ignatius* and *Clement*, were instructed " by the Apostles themselves, and others by such " as had been so instructed, either did not know " what Instructions they had received, or do not



## 22 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ give such Accounts of this Ordinance, as were agreeable to those Instructions.” Whether there be any Reason to affirm, that the first and earliest Writers of Christianity do not give such Accounts of this Ordinance, as are agreeable to the Instructions received from the Apostles, can be known only by comparing and examining the Accounts given by those Writers by the Accounts given by the Writers of the New Testament. And when any Accounts of those first and earliest Writers concerning this Ordinance are produced, the plain, certain, and undoubted Sense of which contradicts what our Author teaches concerning it, it will be Time enough to examine, whether they are agreeable to the Accounts given by the Writers of the New Testament. In the mean Time, until such Accounts are produced, and no such have been produced by the Adversaries of our Author, no Foundation appears for that Suggestion of this Author, Pag. 4. that our Author sets these antient Writers aside, because he is not ignorant, that those first “ and early Writers loudly testify against those low, dry, jejune “ and debasing Notions,” as he is pleased to call them, “ which he has entertained, and endeavoured to propagate concerning this most solemn Institution of Religion;” or that our Author can have such a Reason for setting them aside.

This Author goes on Pag. 7. “ Well then, “ since he will not allow us any Help from the “ most antient Fathers, towards a right understanding of the Nature of this Ordinance, or “ of the Passages of the New Testament, which “ speak of it; let us see what the Holy Penmen “ have recorded concerning it. But who shall explain to us the true Sense and Meaning of the “ Holy

“ Holy Penmen in those Passages? Shall we  
 “ follow this Author's Explication, or that of  
 “ those antient primitive Writers? They give  
 “ one Constrution of those Passages, and he  
 “ gives us another quite different.” This is a  
 Mistake, which all the Adversaries of our Author  
 run into, that it is certain and undeniable, that  
 the most antient, primitive Christian Writers in-  
 terpret the Passages of the New Testament re-  
 lating to the Lord's Supper in a Sense different  
 from our Author. Whereas there is no Inter-  
 pretation of any of those Passages different from  
 our Author's Interpretation, which is confirmed  
 by the unanimous Consent, and concurrent Tes-  
 timony of those primitive Writers; neither do  
 they teach any thing concerning this Ordinance,  
 which necessarily implies, that they so understood  
 those Passages; as will appear more fully hereafter.

This Author goes on, Pag. 8. For my Part  
 “ I shall be determined, not by the Explication  
 “ and unnatural Glosses of our Author, but by  
 “ the unanimous Sense, and concurrent Tes-  
 “ timony of the primitive Writers.” The Rea-  
 sonableness of this Resolution I shall not at present  
 dispute; but only observe, That there are no  
 Explications of the Passages of the New Tes-  
 tament relating to this Duty, contradicting what  
 our Author has taught concerning it, which are  
 confirmed by the *unanimous Sense, and concurrent  
 Testimony of the primitive Writers*; and therefore  
 I believe it will be difficult for him to execute this  
 Resolution.

VI. The *Passages* in the *New Testament*, which  
 relate to this Duty, and they alone, are the  
 only original Accounts of the *Nature* and  
*End* of this *Institution*; and the only authentic  
 Decla-

## 24 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Declarations, upon which we of later Ages can safely depend: being written by the immediate Followers of our Lord; Those who were Witnesses themselves to the *Institution*; or were instructed in it, either by those, who were so, or by *Christ* Himself; and consent in delivering down one and the same Account of this Religious Duty.

With regard to this Proposition I do not perceive, that there is any real Difference between our Author and his Adversaries, and therefore I pass on to the next.

VII. The Writers of the *New Testament* give an Account of the *Institution* of the *Lord's Supper*, in the following *Passages*; which, therefore, are principally to be regarded: viz. St. *Matthew*, chap. xxvi. § 26, &c. St. *Mark*, chap. xiv. § 22, &c. St. *Luke*, chap. xxii. § 19, &c. And St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. chap. xi. § 23, &c.

St. *Matth.* xxvi. 26. *And as they were eating, Jesus took Bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, Take, Eat; This is my Body.*

27. *And he took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it:*

28. *For this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of Sins.*

St. *Mark.* xiv. 22. *And as they did eat, Jesus took Bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them and said, Take, Eat; This is my Body.*

23. *And He took the Cup, and when he had given Thanks, He gave it to them: And they all drank of it.*

24. *And He said unto them, This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.*

St. *Luke* xxii. 19. *And he took Bread, and gave Thanks*



*Thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my Body, which is given for you; This do in Remembrance of me.*

20. *Likewise also the Cup after Supper, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.*

St. Paul, upon occasion of the Indecent and Unchristian Behaviour of some amongst the *Corinthians*, at the Time of their meeting together to partake of the *Lord's Supper*, lays before them, as the most effectual Cure of their Disorders, the following Account of the *Original Institution* of this Holy Rite.

1 Cor. xi. 23. *For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, in the same Night, in which he was betrayed, took Bread:*

24. *And when he had given Thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, Eat; This is my Body, which is broken for you: This do in Remembrance of me.*

25. *After the same manner also, He took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me.*

After this the *Apostle* adds, as his own Observation drawn from the *Institution* itself:

Ver. 26. *For as often as ye Eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death 'till He come.*

From this Account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper our Author observes, First, That it is declared in these Words, that *Christ*, at the Institution of this Sacrament, did not *bless* the Bread and Wine by praying to God over them; but that he *blessed* God, and no otherwise *blessed* the Bread and Wine, than as He spake over them

Words

## 26 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Words of Thanksgiving to God. In Defence of this Observation he first obviates an Objection, which might be brought against it from our Translation; viz. That in St. *Matthew* the Word *IT*, referring to the Bread, being put after *Blessed*, plainly shews, that the Bread was *blessed*, and therefore the Wine likewise. To remove this objection he says, “ that the Word *IT* is “ added by the Translators without any Thing “ in the Original to answer to it, or to require it; “ and that the Translators themselves appear to “ be very far from thinking, that they did right “ in adding it, or that they had any Reason to “ do so, by their not adding it to St. *Mark* xiv. “ 22. tho’ the very same *Greek* Word is used “ by him. ”

To this Dr. *Brett* objects, “ Why is not *IT* “ required after *blessed*, as well as after *brake* and “ *given*?” To which I answer, That *IT* is required after neither; but *IT*, signifying the Bread, may with Certainty be added after *brake* and *gave* without any Doubtfulness, or Fear of misapplying those Acts to the wrong Object, there being nothing, which can be supposed to be *broke* and *given* but the Bread: Whereas it cannot with so great Certainty be added after *blessed*; it is not so clear, that the *Blessing* could terminate in no other Object but the Bread, as that the *Breaking* and *Giving* could not. And the Translators manifestly gave a token of this Uncertainty, and of their Doubtfulness in this Case, by their not adding the Word *IT* after *Blessed* in St. *Mark*; tho’ the very same *Greek* Word be used.

No, says Dr. *Warren*, they do not: “ For “ tho’ they have not added *IT* after *Blessed* in St. “ *Mark*; yet, by adding *IT* after *Brake*, it makes “ the Sense given by them of the Words of St. “ *Mark*

“ *Mark* perfectly the same with their Translation of the Passage in *St. Matthew*.” But their adding *IT* after *Brake*, in *St. Mark*, does not make the Sense of the Words perfectly the same with their Translation of the Passage in *St. Matthew*; except from their adding *IT* after *Brake* it necessarily follows, that they thought and intended, it should be understood after *Blessed*; which does not follow. For there is a Reason for adding *IT* after *Brake*, which does not hold for adding *IT* after *Blessed*; which is that just mentioned; *viz.* That it is not so certain, that *Blessed* must terminate in the Bread, as that *Brake* must; and for any Thing that appears to the contrary, the Translators omitted it after *Blessed* for this Reason. And therefore, tho’ our Author does insinuate, that the Translators of the New Testament did not entertain the Notion of such a proper Consecration, as the Dr. calls it, in the Eucharist, as that the *Blessing* terminated in the Holy Elements, he does them no Injury thereby, as Dr. *Warren* complains; for he insinuates no more, than what their own Translation insinuates.

Our Author proceeds, and says, “ That tho’  
 “ *εὐλογήσας*, which signifies *having blessed*, be  
 “ used by *St. Matthew*, and *St. Mark*, of the  
 “ Bread, yet since *St. Luke*, and *St. Paul*, in  
 “ their Accounts of the Institution, after speak-  
 “ ing of our Saviour’s taking the Bread into his  
 “ Hands, add *εὐχαριστήσας*, which signifies *having*  
 “ *given Thanks*; and since *St. Matthew* and  
 “ *St. Mark* themselves, when speaking of the  
 “ Cup, use the Word *εὐχαριστήσας*; and since  
 “ they all four speak of the same Action of our  
 “ Lord after taking the Bread, and *Christ* can-  
 “ not be supposed to have blessed the Bread in  
 “ any Sense different from that in which he  
 blessed



“ blessed the Wine; and since the Word *ευχαρί-  
 “ στήσας* signifies only *to give Thanks*, and the  
 “ Word *ευλογήσας* signifies naturally and easily  
 “ the same, therefore the Sense of *ευλογήσας* must  
 “ be determined by that of *ευχαριστήσας*, and so  
 “ must signify *to give Thanks*, and that therefore  
 “ *Christ*, after he had taken the Bread and Wine  
 “ into his Hand, only *gave Thanks* over them,  
 “ and no otherwise *blessed* the Bread and Wine,  
 “ than as He spake over them Words of Thankf-  
 “ giving to God.” The Force of the Argument  
 is\* this, *ευλογήσας* and *ευχαριστήσας* must have the  
 same Sense in the Passages, in which the Writers  
 of the New Testament give an Account of the  
 Institution of the Lord’s Supper; *ευλογήσας* is  
 used but twice, *ευχαριστήσας* is used four times,  
*ευλογήσας* in other Places of Scripture signifies both  
 to *bless* by praying to God, and to *give Thanks*,  
 as when it is applied to God, who can be blessed  
 by Man in no other Sense, but by their giving  
 Him Thanks and Praise; *ευχαριστήσας* in other  
 Places of Scripture signifies nothing, but *to give  
 Thanks*; therefore it is most reasonable, that *ευλο-  
 γήσας* should be understood in that one Sense of  
*ευχαριστήσας*, of which it is very capable, and not  
 that *ευχαριστήσας* should be understood in one of  
 the Significations of *ευλογήσας*, of which it is not  
 capable.

To this Dr. Brett answers, “ That it is so  
 “ far from being true, that *ευχαριστήσας* in other  
 “ Places of Scripture signifies nothing, but *to  
 “ give Thanks*; that it is used in some Places,  
 “ where it must signify *to bless*.” The Places  
 the Dr. means, where it is thus used, are those  
 Passages, where the Miracles of the Loaves and  
 Fishes are related. And the Reason he gives,  
 why

why *ευχαριστίας* must in these Passages signify to *bless*, is, "because *Christ* must necessarily have " *blessed* the Loaves and the Fishes, or it had " been impossible they should have multiplied as " they did; since then *ευχαριστίας* is here used, " it must refer to the Loaves and Fishes, and " signify to *bless*." Dr. Warren, p. 35. and *The Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 22. both cite this Place to prove, that *ευχαριστία* signifies to *bless* by offering up Prayer to God.

By *blessing* the Loaves and Fishes here, I suppose these Gentlemen mean, if they mean any Thing to their Purpose, that *Christ* prayed over them to God, that they might answer the End, for which He was then about to use them; that they might be so multiplied, as to fill four or five thousand People. But it was not impossible for the Loaves and Fishes to multiply, as they did, if *Christ* had not *blessed* them by thus praying to God; except it was impossible for *Christ* to multiply them in that Manner without particularly offering up a Prayer to God for that Purpose, which Impossibility no Man can prove. And therefore tho' *ευχαριστίας* be here used, there is no Necessity for it to refer to the Bread, and to signify to *bless*. Certain it is, that *Christ* did multiply the Loaves and the Fishes by a miraculous Power; but that He did this by that Act, which is signified in these Passages by *ευλογίας* and *ευχαριστίας*, does not so clearly appear. On the other hand, as was said with regard to the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, since *ευχαριστίας* in other Places of Scripture plainly signifies only to *give Thanks*, and *ευλογίας* sometimes signifies to give Thanks likewise, it is most natural and reasonable to interpret *ευλογίας* by

### 30 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

by *ευχαρίστας*, and to understand them in the Passages of the Loaves and Fishes to signify to give Thanks. Nothing can be objected to this, but that St. *Luke ix. 16.* says, *ευλόγησεν αὐτούς*, *he blessed them*, and thereby plainly refers the *Blessing* to the Bread. But to this it is answered, that in some ancient MSS. the Words run thus, *ευλόγησεν ἐπ' αὐτούς*, *he blessed over them*, that is, gave Thanks to God over the Loaves and Fishes. And farther this is an *elliptical* Way of Speaking, to be supplied thus, *ευλόγησεν Θεὸν ἐπ' αὐτῶν*, *he blessed God over them*; it being familiar both with Greeks and Hebrews to put *ευλογεῖν τινα* for *ευλογεῖν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τινός*, *to bless a Thing for blessing God over it*.

To prove, that Christ *blessed* the Bread by praying to God over it Dr. *Warren* argues thus:

I. " That the Words of St. *Matthew* and  
 " St. *Mark*, when strictly rendered being these  
 " (*as they were eating, Jesus having taken Bread,*  
 " *and having blessed, brake and gave to the Disci-*  
 " *ples*) it is very plain, that the natural and  
 " obvious Construction of them leads us to sup-  
 " pose, that the Action of *Blessing* must terminate  
 " upon the *Bread*, forasmuch as there is no other  
 " Object expressed, to which it can be referred.  
 " Our Saviour is here said to have taken *Bread*,  
 " and it is allowed by all, that what he *took* he  
 " *brake* and gave to his Disciples, so that in plain  
 " and natural Construction, what he *took* and  
 " *brake* and gave, He *blessed* also. Nothing can  
 " obstruct this Sense of the Words, but either  
 " some *Incongruity* in the Thing, or some *Im-*  
 " *propriety* in the Expression."

Yes, something else may obstruct this Sense, which is, If the Word translated *blessed* be determined to such a Sense, as that the Action of  
*Blessing*



*Blessing* cannot terminate upon the Bread. And to such a Sense it is determined by the Word *ευχαριστίας*, which signifies only *to give Thanks*. Or rather this shews, that there is an *Incongruity* in the Thing to understand the *Blessing*, as terminating upon the Bread.

2. Dr. Warren says, " That if the Word *ευλογίας* does not terminate upon the *Bread* here mentioned; but is to be referred to God, in the Sense of his being the Object *blessed*, at the same time that the Word God is not expressed, it is altogether an unprecedented Manner of speaking. — For whenever the Word *ευλογεῖν* is used, the Object *blessed* is expressed. — And that by Reason of the Variety of Senses of this Word *ευλογεῖν*, and such a Difference of Objects, to which it is applied, it is evidently necessary that the Object, upon which the *Blessing* terminates, should be always named to prevent Uncertainty and Mistakes."

But tho' the Object, upon which the *Blessing* terminates, be not expressed in the Words of the Institution; yet it is plainly signified and determined, that it must be God, and not the Bread by the Word *ευχαριστίας*, which determining the Sense of *ευλογίας* to that of *giving Thanks*, plainly shews, that the *Blessing* must terminate upon God; for it is incongruous to *give Thanks* to the Bread; and thereby all Uncertainty and Mistake is avoided concerning the Object *Blessed*. And if the Object, upon which the *Blessing* terminates, be plainly determined, it is of no Signification, whether it be determined by being expressed, or by some other Means.

3. The Dr. says, " That what our Author urges from a supposed Necessity of explaining  
" the

## 32 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ the Word *εὐλογίας* by the Word *ευχαριστίας*  
 “ is altogether without Foundation. For since  
 “ one must be limited and explained by the  
 “ other, there is a good Reason, why we must  
 “ take just the contrary Way, and explain the  
 “ Sense of the latter by the former, which is  
 “ this; because the Sense of the former, and the  
 “ Manner of its Construction, is settled by the  
 “ frequent and invariable Use of it in the *Septua-*  
 “ *gint*, whereas *ευχαριστῆν* is a Word invented by  
 “ the Writers of the New Testament, and so  
 “ may be used by them in a Manner somewhat  
 “ peculiar.”

But how is the Sense of *εὐλογεῖν* settled by the Use of it in the *Septuagint*? It is no otherwise settled there, than as it is used to signify to *blefs*, the Object of which *Blessing* is sometimes God, and sometimes some Creature, and so is done sometimes by *giving Praise and Thanks* to God, and sometimes by *praying* to God. But this cannot determine, whether in the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper the Blessing signified by it implies *giving Thanks* to God, or *praying* to God, nor whether the *Blessing* terminates upon God or the Bread. But the Word *ευχαριστίας* plainly determines, that the *Blessing* must terminate upon God. For the Word *ευχαριστῆν* being a Word invented by the Writers of the New Testament, as the Dr. says, the Sense of that must be determined by their Use of it. Now they always use it to signify *giving Thanks* or *Praise*; unless we except the Passages of the Miracles of the Loaves and Fishes, where the Sense of it is rendered doubtful by the Word *εὐλογεῖν*. But then in these Passages the Sense of it ought in all Reason to be determined by that Sense, in which

which it is used in other Places, where the Sense of it is plain and certain, since *εὐλογεῖν* is capable of that Sense also, and is often so used; and not by another Sense of *εὐλογεῖν*, in which *εὐχαρισεῖν* is never used in other Places. And according to the same Rule ought the Sense of *εὐχαρισεῖν* to be determined in the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper.

What Dr. *Warren* next says, That "the Use of the Word *εὐχαρισεῖν* in a transitive Sense;" that is, so that the Action signified by it terminates upon the Bread, "and in the very Sense of *εὐλογεῖν*, is not at all forced and unnatural; it is only an Imitation of the *Hebrew* short Way of Writing, instead of expressing it thus, *εὐχαρισήσας τῷ Θεῷ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἄρτης*;" and what he alledges afterwards, "That *Justin Martyr* understood the Word in this transitive Sense, as is evident from his calling the Bread and Wine after Consecration *ἄρτον εὐχαριστηθέντα*, and *οἶνον εὐχαριστηθέντα*, as also *τροφίῳ εὐχαριστησαν*;" makes directly against him; which Argument is also used by Mr. *Bowyer*, p. 11. First, As it confirms that Construction of *εὐλόγησεν* above mentioned in the Miracles of the Loaves and Fishes, which shews, that the *Blessing* does not refer to the Bread there. Secondly, However they may endeavour to conceal the Sense of *εὐχαρισεῖν*, by translating it to *Eucharistize*, yet, as *Eucharistize* is only a *Greek* Word made *English*, it can signify nothing, but what that *Greek* Word does, from which it is made. And as the *Greek* Word *εὐχαρισεῖν* signifies only to give Thanks, *Eucharistize* can signify nothing else; and cannot signify, as Mr. *Bowyer* says it does, p. 12. "To crave a Blessing over the Bread," if he means

D

by



### 34 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

by those Words, *to make a Prayer to God for Divine Grace upon it; because to Eucharistize cannot signify to pray.* If therefore the Bread can be *eucharistized*, so as that the Act of *Eucharistizing* shall terminate upon the Bread, by God's being *eucharistized* over it, that is, by *Thanks being given* to him over it; the Bread may also be *blessed*, so as that the Act of *Blessing* shall terminate upon the Bread, by God's being *blessed* over it, by *Thanks being given* to Him over it; and then here is the Object *blessed* expressed, just as the Doctor would have it.

Dr. *Waterland*, in his Chapter concerning the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, says nothing contrary to what our Author teaches in this Remark; and what he there says, is also agreeable to what I have here said concerning the *Blessing* terminating upon the Bread. He only contends there, that the Bread and Wine are *blessed*, and that this *Blessing* consisted in their being *sanctified*, or *made holy*, by being *set apart to an holy Use*, and thereby contracting a *relative Holiness*; and that they might be *blessed*, as well by *Thanksgiving* only, as by *Prayer*. P. 118. he says, "It is not  
" material to dispute, whether the Consecration  
" formerly was performed by *Thanksgiving*, or by  
" *Prayer*, or by both together: The Forms  
" might differ in different Churches, or at different Times. But the Point, which we are now  
" considering, is, whether a *Benediction* is really  
" conveyed to the Elements in this Service, and  
" whether they are really *sanctified*, or *made holy*." By a *Benediction* being conveyed to the Elements there is meant their being *sanctified*, or *made holy*, or *set apart to an holy Use*. And if by *blessed* in the Words of the Institution we understand *having given*

given Thanks to God, the Blessing, as it implies giving Thanks to God, terminates upon God; but as it implies sanctifying, or making holy the Elements, or setting them apart to an holy Use, by giving Thanks to God over them, it terminates upon the Elements.

Dr. Warren says, that our Author's "Supposition is no very modest one, — That the Word *ευχαρισήσας* was originally in the Text of St. Matthew, and that *ευλογήσας* was transplanted thither by some Transcribers." But as this Supposition of our Author is founded upon Truth, viz. That many Manuscripts of good Note read this very Word *ευχαρισήσας* in this Passage of St. Matthew concerning the Bread instead of *ευλογήσας*, I cannot think it an immodest Supposition; and the Truth, on which it is founded, is such, as makes much for our Author's Cause, and in Confutation of which nothing hath been said.

Dr. Brett next proceeds to prove, that Christ did bless the Bread and Wine by praying to God over them from the Testimony of the Fathers.

The first Father he quotes is Justin Martyr, who tells us, that at the Time of celebrating the Lord's Supper, "Bread, and a Cup of Wine and Water are brought to the President (or Bishop) which he takes, and offers up Praise and Glory to the Father of all Things thro' the Name of the Son and the Holy Ghost; and this Thanksgiving for his vouchsafing us worthy of these Creatures is of more than ordinary Length; when the PRAYERS and THANKSGIVINGS are ended, all the People present conclude with an audible Voice, saying, Amen. Apol. ix. 85.

### 36 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Now it is manifest to any one, who reads this Passage, that it is very far from proving that, when the Lord's Supper was celebrated, Prayer was used for a *Blessing* on the Bread. And this the Doctor confesses in the next Paragraph; and in order to prove, that the Prayers mentioned in this Passage of *Justin Martyr* were used for a *Blessing* on the Bread, understanding by *Blessing* God's sending down some *Virtue* or *Grace* upon the Bread and Wine, and making them to be what they were not before, or a Prayer made to God for that Purpose, he quotes another Father, viz. *St. Irenæus*. But I think, that *Justin Martyr* ought himself to be allowed to interpret his own Words, rather than *Irenæus*. Now, according to his own Interpretation, the Prayers mentioned in this Passage were not made for a *Blessing* on the Bread, but for *God to vouchsafe them worthy of these his Creatures*. By *Justin Martyr's* mentioning both Prayers and Thanksgivings in the latter Part of this Passage it is plain, that Prayer was joined with the Thanksgiving at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper; but by his not mentioning any Favour or Benefit, for which the Prayers were made, different from that, for which the Thanksgivings were made, it is as plain, that they were both made for the same Favour; that as the Thanksgivings were offered to God for his *vouchsafing them worthy of these his Creatures*, as is expressly declared; so the Prayers were made to beseech God *to vouchsafe them to be thus worthy*. Had it been the Sense of *Justin Martyr*, that the Prayers had been made for any other End, doubtless he would have declared, what that End had been; which since he hath not done, it is natural to understand him to mean, that the Prayers



Prayers and Thanksgivings mentioned by him were both made for the same Favour.

Let us next see, what Force there is in the Words cited from *Ireneus* to prove, that *Christ* blessed the Bread and Wine by praying to God over them. His Words are these, "The Bread, " which is from the Earth, receiving the Invocation of God, is no longer common Bread, " but the *Eucharist*." Lib. iv. C. 34. The Word, which the Doctor translates *Invocation*, is in the Original *ἐκκλησιῶν*, which does not properly signify to call upon a Person in the way of Prayer and Petition, but a calling out to God in any manner in the general; and therefore from *Ireneus*'s saying, that the Bread receives the *ἐκκλησιῶν τῷ Θεῷ*, it does not follow that Prayer is made to God over the Bread; but the Bread would as much receive the *ἐκκλησιῶν τῷ Θεῷ* by calling out to God in giving Him Thanks and Praises over the Bread.

The Doctor farther says, "If the Bread be " changed from common Bread, and made the " *Eucharist* by Invocation and Prayer, then it is " certain, that Prayer must be made to God for " his *Blessing* on the Bread, otherwise it cannot " be made what it was not before," that is, the *Eucharist*.

But with regard to this Argument I observe first, That the Word translated *Invocation* does not signify Prayer, and that it does not appear from these Words, that the Bread was made the *Eucharist* by Prayer.

Secondly, How does the Bread, when it is become the *Eucharist*, differ from common Bread? or in what Sense can the Bread in the Lord's Supper be called the *Eucharist*? I know of no

### 38 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Sense, in which it can be called so, but as it is Bread set apart from common Use, to be eaten by Men to preserve in them the Remembrance of *Christ's* dying for them, which should excite them to the greatest Praise and Thanksgivings to God. And then the Bread may be changed from common Bread to the *Eucharist* by any other Act, as well as by Prayer being made to God for his Blessing on it; it may be changed from common Bread to the *Eucharist* by any Act, which is appointed, and known to be performed to set the Bread apart from common Use to be eaten by Men to preserve in them the Remembrance of *Christ's* dying for them, which should excite them to the greatest Praise and Thanksgivings to God; it may be changed from common Bread to the *Eucharist* by giving Praise and Thanks to God over it<sup>a</sup>.

The next Authority produced by the Doctor is that of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who expressly says, that *Christ* blessed the Wine, εὐλόγησέν τε τὸν οἶνον. Now it must be observed, that the Dispute is not, whether *Christ* did *bless* the Bread in any Sense; but whether he *blessed* it by *praying* to God, or by *offering up Thanks and Praises* over it. And then tho' we allow *Clemens Alexandrinus* rightly to understand the Words of this Sacrament, and to intend that right Sense in these Words εὐλόγησέν τε τὸν οἶνον contained in this Passage; yet it is of no Force to shew, whether *Christ* *blessed* the Wine by praying to God over it, or by offering up Thanks and Praise; because the Word here used is the same, that is used in the Words of the Institution, and about the Signification of which

^ of the  
Institution

<sup>a</sup> See Page 33, 34.

the Dispute is, which cannot be determined by itself, when used with regard to the same Object, as it is here. And the Strength of the Father's Argument for the sober Use of Wine is equally strong, if *Christ* gave Thanks and Praise to God over it, as if he prayed to him over it. For our Saviour would no more thank and praise God for that, which it was unlawful for Men to use, than he would pray to God to send down some Virtue or Grace upon it, or that it might obtain the End, for which it was used.

Dr. Brett, p. 19. brings another Argument to prove, that *Christ* did *bless* the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them, from St. Paul's Epistle to the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. x. 16. where he says of the Cup used at the Lord's Supper, *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ?* In which Words he says, "The Apostle expressly affirms, that they *blessed* the Cup, that is, the Wine in it, when they celebrated the Holy Communion, and if they *blessed* the Wine, no doubt but they *blessed* the Bread also." Dr. Warren likewise, p. 35. and Mr. Bowyer, p. 15. and *the Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 23. cite this Passage to prove, that the *Blessing* must terminate upon the Bread and Wine, so that they were *blessed* by a *Prayer being made* to God over them.

But I have before shewn, that the Bread and Wine may be *blessed*, so as that the *Blessing* terminates upon them, by giving Thanks to God over them<sup>a</sup>. And as the same Word is here used by St. Paul with regard to the Wine, which is used by *Christ* in the Words of the Institution, it

<sup>a</sup> See Page 34.



is only proving *Idem per Idem*; it is no more than saying, that *εὐλογεῖν*, when used with regard to the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, signifies to *blefs* them by *praying* to God over them, because *εὐλογεῖν*, when used with regard to the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, signifies to *blefs* them by *praying* to God over them. They take it for granted, that *εὐλογῶμεν*, when used by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, signifies to *blefs* the Wine by *praying* to God over it, and thence infer, that *εὐλογήσας*, in the Words of the Institution, must signify so too. Whereas before they can make this Conclusion, they should prove, that *εὐλογῶμεν*, in this Place of St. Paul, signifies to *blefs* the Cup by *praying* to God over it, of which they give no Proof.

Let us consider a little what Dr. Brett says in Defence of the Conclusion, he draws from these Words. He says, "That our Author endeavours to make this Text of St. Paul insignificant as to the Point of Blessing, by recurring to his former Argument, and telling us, that "Blessing here signifies bare Thanksgiving." And it is true, that our Author does say, that the Blessing here signifies bare Thanksgiving; and this his Assertion is founded upon the Argument, by which he proves, that *εὐλογήσας*, in the Words of the Institution, signifies to give Thanks. Having proved, that *εὐλογήσας*, in the Words of the Institution, signifies to give Thanks to God, he infers, that *εὐλογῶμεν*, in St. Paul's Epistle, when used with regard to the Wine, signifies to give Thanks likewise. And a very just Way of arguing it is; and to confute which Dr. Brett says nothing, but by affirming, without giving any Reason, that *εὐλογῶμεν* is used by St. Paul, to signify

signify  *blessing*  the Wine by  *praying*  to God over it; as may be seen in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Page of his Book, where he says, " That the Sense of this Text is " clear, that the Cup was  *blessed* ," that is, by  *praying*  to God over it, that it might become the Body and Blood of  *Christ*  in Virtue and Efficacy, and be a Means of conveying to the worthy Receivers of it the Benefits of  *Christ* 's Death at and by the very Act of receiving it; (for in this Sense I always understand the Adversaries of our Author, when they use the Word  *Bless*  with regard to the Bread and Wine,) because the Apostle says,  *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless* , without ever proving, that the Word  *εὐλογῶμεν*  here used by the Apostle, and translated to  *bless* , necessarily signifies in this Text to  *bless*  by offering up Prayer to God.

Our Author brings another Argument besides this to shew, that St.  *Paul*  calls the Cup,  *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless* , because Words of Thanksgiving and Praise to God were spoke over it; which is, that this Cup answers to the Cup in the Paschal Supper, which was called the Cup of  *Blessing*  for no other Reason, but because Words of Praise and Thanksgivings to God were spoke over it; whence our Author infers, that the Cup in the Lord's Supper is called by St.  *Paul* ,  *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless* , for the same Reason.

To this Argument Dr.  *Brett*  answers, " That " the Cup in the Lord's Supper does not answer " to the Cup drank at the Paschal Supper, because the Cup in the Paschal Supper had been " drank before  *Christ*  began the Institution of the " Holy Eucharist." But notwithstanding this, the Cup in the Lord's Supper may answer to the Cup

Cup in the Paschal Supper in the Sense of our Author, who, as appears from his *Appendix*, where he explains the name *Eucharist*, by which the Lord's Supper is often called, intends, that the Cup in the Lord's Supper answers to the Cup in the Paschal Supper, as it alludes to it; as it is called by St. Paul, *the Cup of Blessing*, which we *bless* in Allusion or Reference to the Cup, called the Cup of *Blessing*, used in the Paschal Supper; and so the Cup in the Lord's Supper was called, *the Cup of Blessing* for the same Reason, that the Cup in the Passover was so called. And it does not disprove this to say, that the Cup in the Paschal Supper was drunk, before *Christ* began the Institution of the Holy Eucharist. For tho' it was drunk before this; yet *Christ* might *bless* the Cup at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist in the same Manner, in which the *Jews* *blessed* the Cup in the Paschal Supper. And when the Cup of *Blessing* in the Paschal Supper was called the Cup of Blessing; because the *Jews* gave Thanks and Praise to God over it, it is very natural, and there is good Reason from thence, to understand St. Paul, when he calls the Cup in the Lord's Supper, *the Cup of Blessing*, to call it so for the same Reason, that the Paschal Cup was so called. If *Christ* had called the Cup, *the Cup of Blessing* at the Time, when he instituted the Lord's Supper, the Apostles would doubtless have understood him to call it *the Cup of Blessing* in the same Sense, in which that Cup was called, *the Cup of Blessing*, which He had just before given unto them, and they had drunk of. And if the Apostles would so have understood *Christ* at the Time of the Institution of this Sacrament, it is certainly reasonable, that we should so understand St.



St. Paul, when afterwards he calls the Sacramental Cup, *the Cup of Blessing*.

The next Argument our Author brings to prove, that the Cup in the Lord's Supper is called by St. Paul, *the Cup of Blessing*, which we bless, because Words of Praise and Thanksgivings to God were spoke over it, is the Authority of St. Chrysostom and Theophylact, who both interpret these Words of St. Paul to signify, *The Cup over which we give Praise and Thanksgiving to him; who poured out his Blood for us.*

Against their Authority Dr. Brett has nothing to say; and allows, that St. Chrysostom and Theophylact do call the Cup in the Lord's Supper, *the Cup of Blessing*, because having it in our Hands, we sing Hymns of Praise to God. Nevertheless he affirms, that this Text of St. Paul does prove, " That the Cup was *blessed* by praying to God  
" over it without contradicting St. Chrysostom  
" and Theophylact; because when they say, the  
" Cup is called *the Cup of Blessing*, because  
" having it in our Hands, we sing Hymns of  
" Praise, they interpret only those Words of St.  
" Paul, *the Cup of Blessing*; but not those other  
" Words, *which we bless*, in which last Words,  
" the Word *bless* signifies something different from  
" the Word *Blessing* in the former; that it signi-  
" fies to *bless* the Cup by *praying* to God over it." But could any Man imagine or say, that *εὐλογῆσας* and *εὐλογῶμεν* here have different Significations, when their having the same implies no Incongruity, nor contradicts any known Truth, or that St. Paul called the Cup, *the Cup of Blessing* for any other Reason, but for what was done by that Act, which is signified by the Word *εὐλογῶμεν*, except he wanted an Argument to prove, that the

#### 44 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the Cup was *blessed* by praying to God over it, and could find no better?

Moreover, it follows from that Dr. Brett himself says in the next Sentence, that *Blessing* includes what is signified by *blefs*. For if, as the Doctor says, “ Had St. Paul only called it *the Cup of Blessing*, and not also added, *which we blefs*, it might be thought, that it, *the Cup*, “ received its Name of *the Cup of Blessing* only “ from God’s being blessed over it by Thanks “ and Praise being given to him over it;” it follows, that St. Paul’s adding *which we blefs* imports, that there is another Reason, besides that of Blessing and Praises being given to God over it, for the Cup’s receiving the Name of *the Cup of Blessing*; but this other Reason, as well as that of Blessing and Praises being given to God over the Cup, is signified by the Word *Blessing*, the Name, which the Cup receives for these two Reasons. Now that other Reason the Doctor says, is signified by the Word *blefs*, and therefore what is signified by the Word *blefs* is included in that of *Blessing*; and then when St. Chrysostom and Theophylact interpret the Word *Blessing* in those Words *the Cup of Blessing*, they do likewise interpret the Word *blefs* in those other Words *which we blefs*, the Sense of the latter being included in the former. But they say, that *Blessing* signifies only *to blefs and praise God*, and therefore *blefs* must signify so too; had they thought there had been any Thing more included in the Signification of the word *Blessing* in this Place, doubtless they would have mentioned it.

Dr. Brett farther says, “ That *blefs* cannot “ signify to *thank and praise*, because then we “ shall make St. Paul say, *The Cup of Thanks* “ and

“ and Praise, which we thank and praise; and  
 “ that our Author was aware of this Difficulty,  
 “ and, to solve it, has put in the Word *over*; but  
 “ that this is to take too much Liberty with  
 “ Scripture.” But as the Word *over* added by  
 our Author, solves the Difficulty here mentioned  
 by the Doctor; so he cannot properly be said to  
 have put in the Word *over*, but justly to have in-  
 terpreted a peculiar Phrase familiar to the *Greeks*  
 and *Hebrews*, viz. of putting εὐλογεῖν τινα for  
 εὐλογεῖν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τινός, *To bless a Thing for blessing*  
*God over it*, to which Phrase there is none in  
*English*, that exactly answers, and which therefore  
 is more liable to be misunderstood, if translated  
 strictly according to the Letter.

But says Dr. Brett, “ Tho’ St. Chrysostom does  
 “ say it was called *the Cup of Blessing*, because  
 “ they blessed and praised God, while they had it  
 “ in their Hands; yet he elsewhere teaches, that  
 “ the Bread, and consequently the Cup, was  
 “ *sanctified and blessed*.” To prove this, he cites  
 a Passage of his out of his Epistle to *Cæsarius*;  
*Before the Bread is sanctified*, “ that is, *blessed*, says  
 “ the Doctor, (for bless and sanctify are in this  
 “ Sense synonymous”) *We indeed call it Bread,*  
*but when the Divine Grace has sanctified it, at the*  
*Mediation or Prayer of the Priest, it is freed from*  
*that Name, altho’ the Nature of Bread remain in*  
*it*.”

In answer to this, I observe first, That if *blessed*  
 and *sanctified* are synonymous, then *bless* signifies

\* Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem quidem nominamus,  
 Divinâ autem illum sanctificante Gratiâ, mediante sacerdote,  
 liberatus est quidem appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in illo  
 permanserit. Petr. Mart. Loc. commun. p. 854. Edit. Lond.  
 1583.



only to make Holy, to set apart the Bread from a common to an holy Use, which is the Signification of *Sanctify*, and to do which *Prayer* does not appear to be necessary; but it may be done by *Thanksgiving* only<sup>a</sup>. Secondly, the Word *Prayer* is an entire Addition of the Doctors without any Foundation, the original Words being only *Mediante Sacerdote*, by the Mediation of the Priest, but not a Word of *Prayer*; and therefore by the Bread's being said to be *sanctified* by the Mediation of the Priest in general, it does not appear by what particular Act of the Priest it was *sanctified*, but that it might as well be *sanctified* by his *praising* and *thanking* God over the Bread, as by *praying* to Him.

Thus have I gone through, and examined the Reasons, which the Adversaries of our Author bring to confute him in saying, that *Christ* at the Institution of this Sacrament no otherwise *blessed* the Bread and Wine, than as He spoke over them Words of *Thanksgiving* to God. And I have done this for no other Reason, than to shew, that the Reasons given by our Author to prove, that *εὐλογῆσας* signifies to *bless* God by offering up Thanks or Praise to him, and no otherwise to *bless* the Bread, than by Thanks or Praise being offered to God over it, are more clear, plain, and conclusive, than any Reasons his Adversaries have brought to prove that *εὐλογῆσας* signifies to *bless* the Bread by praying to God over it, not that I think it of any Signification towards determining the main Point in Question, *viz.* What is the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, whether we understand *Christ* to have *blessed* the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them,

<sup>a</sup> See Page 34. and 38.

or by giving Thanks or Praise over them, by that Conclusions following from allowing, that *Christ* blessed the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them, which the Adversaries of our Author would infer from it, viz. That *Christ* thereby made the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood in a virtual energetical Sense, in Virtue and Efficacy, in Spirit and in Power, so as, by some Virtue annexed to them thereby, to convey the Benefits of *Christ's* Death to the worthy Receivers along with themselves, at and by the very Act of receiving them. That the Adversaries of our Author would draw this Inference from understanding the Words *ευλογήσας* and *ευχαριστήσας* to signify *having blessed* the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them, appears from what Dr. Brett says, p. 19. after he had set down our Author's Paraphrase upon the Words of the Institution.

“ And here we see the plain Reason, why this  
 “ Gentleman endeavoured to prove, that *Christ*  
 “ in the Institution, did not *bless* the Bread and  
 “ the Cup, because, if he did *bless* them, he com-  
 “ municated some Virtue to them, which they had  
 “ not before, and that he really made them what  
 “ himself called them, that is, his Body and  
 “ Blood, not indeed his natural Body and Blood,  
 “ as the *Romanists* hold in their absurd Doctrine  
 “ of Transubstantiation, but his Body and Blood  
 “ in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in  
 “ Power.” See likewise Mr. Bowyer, p. 83.

Now allowing that *Christ* did *bless* the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them, it does not from thence appear, that he conveyed any Virtue to them thereby; what that Virtue was; or what was the End, for which he then used them. Tho' we allow, that, if *Christ* did pray to God over the Bread and Wine, he implored, that they

48 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

they might receive the Virtue, which he intended to convey to them by so praying, if he intended to convey any Virtue to them thereby, and also to answer the End, for which he then used them; yet that he did intend to convey any Virtue at all to the Bread and Wine by so praying, what that particular Virtue was, and what was the End, for which he then used them, does not appear from its being said in the general, that *Christ* prayed over the Bread and Wine. Were the particular Contents of this Prayer set down, then indeed it would evidently appear, whether by praying over the Bread and Wine *Christ* intended to convey any Virtue to them or not, what that Virtue was, and what was the End, for which he used them at the Time he instituted this Sacrament. But since the Contents of this Prayer are not recorded in Scripture, before it can be known, whether *Christ* intended to convey any Virtue to the Bread and Wine by praying over them, what that Virtue was, and what was the End, for which he then used them, it must be some otherwise proved, than from the *Blessing* or *Praying* in general, whether *Christ* did intend to convey any Virtue to the Bread, and Wine, what that particular Virtue was, and what was the End, for which he then used them. To give an Instance of this in the Sense, in which Dr. Brett says, the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ*; that they are his Body and Blood in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in Power. Now it does not appear from its being said in the general, that *Christ* prayed over the Bread and Wine, that he prayed, that they might become his Body and Blood in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in Power, nor by



by Consequence that they were made such. Before it can be proved from the *Blessing* or *Praying*, that *Christ* prayed, that the Bread and Wine might become his Body and Blood in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in Power, it must appear that this was the particular Contents of the Prayer, which he offered to God over them. But since the particular Contents of this Prayer are not set down, it must be some other wise proved, than from its being said in general, that *Christ* blessed the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them, that he did thereby make them his Body and Blood in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in Power. The same may be said of any other Sense of the Bread and Wine being the Body and Blood of *Christ*; as for instance, what Dr. *Warren* says, p. 37. which is more intelligible than what Dr. *Brett* says, That the Bread and Wine are so the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as that they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death by the very Acts of receiving them; (I add these last Words, which must be the Doctor's Meaning here, or he says nothing contrary to our Author, who allows, that the Bread and Wine are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, but not by the very Act of receiving them) that this does not appear from its being said in the General, that *Christ* blessed, or *prayed* over the Bread. If *Christ* did pray over the Bread and Wine, probably he implored God, that they might answer the End, for which he then used them; and were the particular Contents of this Prayer set down, thence it would appear for what end he then used them. But since the Contents of this Prayer are not set down,

it must be some otherwise proved, than from the *Blessing* or *Prayer* in General, what was the particular End, for which *Christ* used the Bread and Wine, and in what Sense he called them, and intended they should be his Body and Blood. And therefore the Adversaries of our Author had no Reason to imagine, that he endeavoured to prove, that *Christ* did not *bless* the Bread and Wine by *praying* to God over them, because, if he did so *bless* them, it would thence follow, that they were the Body and Blood of *Christ* in their Sense, that is, in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in Power, or as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them, the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by the very Act of receiving them, so as that the Benefits are conveyed along with the material Elements; since tho' *Christ* did *bless* the Bread and Wine by *praying* over them, yet this would not follow from it.

Dr. *Warren*, objects to our Author's fourth Remark after this Proposition, under which he gives a Paraphrase upon all the Words of the Institution recorded by the several *Evangelists* and St. *Paul*. Which Paraphrase the Dr. says, "as it stands, and as you have further explained your Meaning in it by what follows, is plainly designed to represent the Holy Ordinance of the *Lord's Supper*, a low and lifeless Ceremony, without any particular Power or Effect, for the Benefit of the Receivers, and without any other Reason or End, but to remember *Christ*, by thus publicly acknowledging him for our Master."

But here I must bring the same Charge against the Doctor, which he does against our Author, that he assumes, what is so far from being evident,

dent, or indeed probable, that it is manifestly false. He assumes, that our Author in this Paraphrase designed to represent the Lord's Supper a *low and lifeless Ceremony*, without any particular Power or Effect for the Benefit of the Receivers, and without any other Reason or End, but to remember *Christ*, by thus publicly acknowledging him for our Master. Our Author in this Paraphrase, represents the Lord's Supper, as an Ordinance appointed by *Christ*, in which he commands his Disciples to eat Bread and drink Wine in a religious Remembrance of him after his Death and Departure out of the World. But now from this Representation of the Lord's Supper it must be manifest to any one, that there is some other Reason and End for it, than *barely to remember Christ* without any good End or Purpose to be served by remembering him; except to one, who can have so mean and low an Opinion of *Christ*, as to think he would be the Author of so mean and useless an Ordinance, which had no other Reason and End of it, but *barely to remember him*. For if he has not such a mean and low Opinion of *Christ*, when he hears of an Ordinance appointed by him, he must necessarily think, that it has some other Reason and End, and that some good End and Purpose is to be served thereby. And as manifest is it, that the Remembrance of *Christ*, which Persons are commanded to have, when they eat this Bread and drink this Wine, naturally tends to revive and keep alive in their Minds all such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Tendencies, as are proper to work upon the Conduct of their Lives; to cause them to perform the Gospel Covenant, and so have a Title to the Benefits of *Christ's* Death



52 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

here, and be made Partakers of them hereafter, which is a Power and Effect for the Benefit of the Receivers. Our Author therefore in this Paraphrase does not represent the Lord's Supper such a *low lifeless* Ceremony, as Dr. *Warren* says he does, without giving any Reason for that Assertion; nor by Consequence ought to be supposed to design so to represent it.

Dr. *Warren* farther objects to this Paraphrase, that there are three Things assumed in it, which are either precarious or false.

First, "That our Blessed Saviour, when He  
" gave his Disciples the Bread and Wine, and  
" called them his Body and Blood, did it only  
" to introduce his Command to them, and to  
" shew them, that they were to take, break and  
" eat Bread in Remembrance of his Body broken,  
" and to drink Wine in Remembrance of his  
" Blood shed for the good of them and others."

To prove this to be an Assumption of what is precarious or false, the Doctor says, "Is not  
" this to suppose our Saviour to use these Words  
" for a Reason, which would have been much  
" better answered by not using them at all?  
" Does he more plainly shew his Disciples, what  
" they were to do, or does he with any greater  
" Propriety introduce his new Command of eat-  
" ing Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance  
" of his Body and Blood, by first calling them  
" emphatically his Body and Blood? Does it not  
" indeed serve to make the Expression uncertain  
" in its Meaning, that could not otherwise be  
" mistaken?" To all which Questions I answer,  
That what is here asserted by our Author, is not  
to suppose our Saviour to use these Words, that  
is, *The Words*, in which he calls the Bread and  
Wine

Wine his Body and Blood, for a Reason, which would have been much better answer'd by not using them at all. For he does more plainly shew his Disciples, what they were to do, and by Consequence does with greater Propriety introduce his new Command of eating Bread and drinking Wine, in Remembrance of his Body and Blood, by first calling them his Body and Blood. By calling the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood, he plainly and expressly appoints and declares them to be the *Signs* and *Memorials* of his Body and Blood, and thereby does more plainly shew his Disciples, that they were to believe and think the Bread and Wine to be the *Signs* and *Memorials* of his Body and Blood, than if he had not emphatically called them so. And tho' in saying *Eat this Bread and drink this Wine in Remembrance of me*, it is indeed imported, that the Bread and Wine are the *Signs* and *Memorials* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*; yet by *Christ's* particularly calling them his Body and Blood is this more strongly and plainly signified.

Neither does *Christ*, by calling the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood, make the Expression uncertain in its Meaning; whether by the *Expression* be meant only *This is my Body, This is my Blood*; or the whole Form of the Institution. There could not be any Uncertainty in the Meaning with regard to the Apostles. For when *Christ*, while he was eating of the Paschal Lamb, or just afterwards, which was called the Lord's Pas-fover, as it was a Sign and Memorial of the Lord's passing over the Houses of the Children of *Israel* in *Egypt*, when he smote the *Egyptians*, and delivered their Houses, to be killed and eaten in Remembrance of it; when *Christ*, I say, while he

#### 54 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

was eating of this Paschal Lamb, or just after, took Bread and Wine, and called them his Body and Blood, and gave them to his Disciples to be eaten and drunk, and commanded them in that Manner to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of him, the Apostles could not but understand him to mean, that the Bread and Wine were his Body and Blood in the same Sense, in which the Paschal Lamb was the Lord's Passover; that as the Paschal Lamb was the Lord's Passover, as it was a Sign and Memorial of it, so the Bread and Wine were the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they were the Signs and Memorials of them. The Apostles must naturally understand our Saviour in this Sense; there is no Appearance of any Reason for them to understand him in any other, and so no Room for any Uncertainty about his Meaning. Neither is there any Uncertainty in the Meaning of the Expression to *Christians* now, if they would but be contented with that plain and obvious Meaning, which naturally arises from the whole Words of the Institution taken together; and not look out for a Meaning, which has no Foundation in the Words themselves, nor in any other Passage of Scripture. For when *Christ* calls the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood, and gives them to the Apostles to eat and drink, and then adds, *This do*, thus eat Bread and drink Wine, in Remembrance of me, it is natural to understand him to call the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood, as they were to be the Signs and Memorials of them, to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of him. Those Words, *This do in Remembrance of me*, plainly determine the Bread and Wine to be called the Body and Blood of *Christ* in this Sense,

if



if *Remembrance* here signifies the Remembrance of Man; and I shall shew hereafter, that there are no sufficient Reasons to understand it to signify the Remembrance of God\*. And here I may make use of the Doctor's Argument against himself, which he uses against our Author in his Objection to his Title. Was a plain *Græcian* to read the Words of the Institution in *Greek*, or a plain *Englishman* to read them in our *English* Translation, he would be apt to think, that *ἀνάμνησις* or *Remembrance*, signified the Remembrance of Man, that *Christ* commanded his Disciples thus to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of him, that they themselves might remember him. And if this be the plain, natural Sense of the Words, *This do in Remembrance of me*, then do they plainly determine the Bread and Wine to be called the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are the Signs and Memorials of them.

The Doctor goes on, "This Notion," that is, the Notion that the Bread and Wine were called the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death along with themselves the material Elements, "is confirmed by this, " that the Disciples, to whom the Words of the " Institution were spoken, and who were to instruct all others in the true Sense and Meaning " of them, could hardly be thought capable of " understanding them in any other. For 'tis " certain, that altho' the *Jews* looked upon the " Passchal Supper, but as a Memorial of the Lamb " first slain in *Egypt*, upon which God promised

\* See under Prop. 10.

“ to pass over the Houses of the Children of  
 “ *Israel*, when he slew the first born of the  
 “ *Egyptians*; yet they called it the *Lord's Pass-*  
 “ *over*, and esteemed it not as an empty Sign, but  
 “ a true and real Sacrament, an holy and reli-  
 “ gious Action, by which they were entitled to  
 “ the Benefits and Advantages of the Covenant  
 “ of God with their Forefathers. When there-  
 “ fore just at the End of this Paschal Supper,  
 “ when this Notion was fresh and present in the  
 “ Minds of the Disciples, our Saviour instituted  
 “ his Supper in the room of what he had then been  
 “ partaking of, in Remembrance of the Sacrifice  
 “ of the Cross, then immediately to be offered, it  
 “ was extremely natural for them to think, that  
 “ the Bread and Wine were called the Body and  
 “ Blood of *Christ*, in the same Sense as the Pas-  
 “ chal Lamb was called the *Lord's Passover*,  
 “ that is, in the Sense of its being the Means of  
 “ communicating the Benefits of the Sacrifice of  
 “ himself upon the Cross to all worthy Receivers,  
 “ as That was of imparting to the *Jews* the  
 “ Benefits of God's Covenant with them.”

In answer to which I observe, First, That if we  
 are guided by the Scripture, the Paschal Supper  
 was not *primarily* and *principally* a Memorial of  
 the Lamb first slain in *Egypt*; but of the Lord's  
 passing over the Houses of the Children of *Israel*  
 in *Egypt*, when he smote the *Egyptians*, and de-  
 livered their Houses; and of the Deliverance  
 from Bondage consequent to this. For of this it  
 is in Scripture plainly declared to be a Memorial,  
 but not of the Lamb first slain. Thus, *Exod. xii.*  
*14. And this Day shall be unto you for a Memo-*  
*rial; and you shall keep it a Feast to the Lord*  
*throughout your Generations.* Where there can

be no doubt, but that the Day was to be a Memorial of what is expressed in the foregoing Verse, of God's passing over them, and the Plague not being upon them, when he smote the Egyptians; and if the Day was a Memorial of this, the Feast kept upon that Day, by keeping of which the Day was observed and kept as a Memorial, was doubtless a Memorial of the same. Again it is said, Ver. 26, 27. *And it shall come to pass, when your Children say unto you, What mean you by this Service? that ye shall say, It is the Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the Houses of the Children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our Houses.* And again, Chap. xiii. v. 8, 9. *And thou shalt shew thy Son in that Day, saying, This, that is, the Service of the Passover, is done, because of that, which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt.* And it, that is, the Service of the Passover, shall be for a Sign unto thee upon thine Hand, and for a Memorial between thine Eyes. In which Words it is plain, that the Service of the Passover, and by consequence the Paschal Supper, which is included in it, and was the principal Part of it, was to be a Sign and Memorial of that, which the Lord did to the Israelites, when they came forth out of Egypt; which was, that he passed over the Houses of the Children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered their Houses, and then carrying them forth out of Egypt, delivered them out of Captivity.

Secondly, I observe, that from these Texts of Scripture it appears, that the Paschal Lamb, and by consequence the Supper upon it, was called the Lord's Passover, not because it was a Means of imparting to the Jews the Benefits of God's Covenant



58 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*nant with them by the very Act of eating it, so as to be conveyed along with the material Meat, and at the very Time, when they performed the outward Act of eating; but because it was a Sign and Memorial of the Lord's passing over the Houses of the Children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians; to be killed and eaten in Remembrance of it, and of their Deliverance from Bondage consequent to it. And therefore neither the Jews, nor the Disciples of our Saviour could call or esteem the Paschal Lamb or Supper to be called the Lord's Passover, as it was the Means of imparting to the Jews the Benefits of God's Covenant with them at and by the very Act of eating it. And so this Argument of the Doctor's to prove, that Christ called the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood, as they were to be Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of Christ's Death at and by the very Act of eating them, taken from the almost Necessity, that the Apostles must understand him to call them his Body and Blood for that Reason, falls to the Ground; because there appears to be no Reason for the Apostles to esteem the Paschal Lamb or Supper to be the Lord's Passover in that Sense, which the Doctor says, must lead them so to understand our Saviour, when he called the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood. But if the Jews, or Disciples of our Lord did call, or esteem the Paschal Lamb or Supper to be the Lord's Passover, as it was a Means of imparting to the Jews the Benefits of God's Covenant with them, they called and esteemed it to be so for a Reason different from that, which is given for that Name of it in Scripture, and also for a Reason, for which there is no Foundation in Scripture, and therefore*

therefore in so doing were mistaken. And I think it not probable, that their wrong Notion of the Passover should lead them to a right Notion of the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, says Dr. Warren, you assume for Truth, that our blessed Saviour called, *The Wine his Blood of the new Covenant, or the new Covenant in his Blood* for this Reason only, because *the Wine is to be drunk in Remembrance of his Blood, which Blood was a Seal to the Truth of the new Covenant.* So that as you afterwards explain yourself, the Wine in the Sacrament is not itself a Seal or Confirmation of the Covenant, and a Conveyance of the Benefits of it to the Receivers, but a Memorial only of the Blood of Christ, which was the Seal of the Covenant.

To prove this Assumption of our Author to be groundless, Dr. Warren argues thus; That it is reasonable to accept that for the true Meaning of our Saviour, when he calls the Wine *the new Covenant in his Blood*, which the Disciples must necessarily have apprehended to be his Meaning. But the Disciples must necessarily understand his Meaning to be, that the Wine was a Means of conveying to them the Benefits and Advantages of that new Covenant, he was just then about to Seal with his own Blood. Now this Argument is founded upon false Suppositions, and therefore must be false, and inconclusive.

The first Supposition it is founded upon is this, That the Blood of the Paschal Lamb, that was first sprinkled, was the Seal of the Covenant, that God entered into with their Forefathers in Egypt. But this the Disciples could not know, because

60 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

because it is no where affirmed in Scripture, nor can be proved from it.

The second Supposition is, "Of which," that is, of which Blood of the Paschal Lamb first sprinkled, "the Blood ever after poured out before the Lord was a Memorial." But this is not true; for the Paschal Lambs slain ever after the first, and by consequence the Blood of them were not a Memorial of the Blood of the Lamb first sprinkled; but of what the Lord did to the Children of *Israel*, when he brought them out of *Egypt*, as has been above shewn<sup>a</sup>.

The third Supposition is, "And as they believed their drinking of the Cup, called the Cup of Salvation, at the close of the Paschal Supper, was the Means of their renewing the said Covenant, and applying to themselves the Blessings and Privileges of it." This also the Disciples could not believe; because it is no where affirmed, nor can be proved from Scripture; and therefore there is no sufficient Reason to believe it. And as the Reasons given, why the Disciples must necessarily understand *Christ* to mean, when he called the Wine, *the Blood of the new Covenant, or the new Covenant in his Blood*, that the Wine was a Means of conveying to them the Benefits of that *new Covenant* he was just then about to seal with his own Blood, by the very Act of drinking it, appear to be false, there appears to be no Necessity for the Disciples to understand him in that Sense, nor any Proof, that it was his true Meaning.

The Doctor goes on, "And what would the more confirm them in this Notion, is, the Conformity, that there is between the Expression

<sup>a</sup> See Page 57.

" here,



“ here, and what was used in a parallel Case,  
 “ when God established his Covenant with  
 “ *Abraham*. For God then says, *This is the*  
 “ *Covenant, that I will make with you. Every*  
 “ *Male among you shall be circumcised.* Gen. xvii.  
 “ 10. Here the *Circumcision of every Male* is  
 “ called *God's Covenant with Abraham*, just as in  
 “ the Words of the Institution, *the Cup or Wine*  
 “ is called the *Covenant*. But they knew, and  
 “ we know, that the Rite of Circumcision was  
 “ not a bare Sign of there being a Covenant be-  
 “ between God and *Abraham*, and his Seed, but  
 “ a Seal of the same also, an actual declaring  
 “ and confirming the same, and an Application  
 “ of the Benefits thereof to those, who received  
 “ it.”

But neither did they know, neither can we know, that the Rite of *Circumcision* was not a bare Sign of there being a Covenant between God and *Abraham*, and his Seed; but was a Seal of the same also, an actual declaring and confirming the same, and an Application of the Benefits thereof to those, who received it; since this cannot be proved from Scripture, but the contrary. For thus it is said, Gen. xvii. 11. *And ye shall circumcise the Flesh of your Foreskin, and it shall be a Token of the Covenant betwixt me and you.* And tho' from Circumcision's being called the Token of the Covenant it may follow, that it was a Seal of, and an actual declaring and confirming of the Covenant, in the Sense of its being a Token and Memorial of it, and thereby a continual standing Evidence, that there was a Covenant between God and *Abraham*, and his Seed; yet it will not thence follow, that it was the Application of the Benefits of the Covenant to those, who

## 62 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

who received it. And its being said of Circumcision, that it was to be a *Token* of the Covenant, immediately after it had been expressly called the *Covenant*, is a good Foundation to understand our Saviour, when he calls the Wine *his Blood of the new Covenant*, or *the new Covenant in his Blood*, to mean, that it was the Token or Memorial of his Blood, by which the new Covenant was sealed, and in which it was founded; or the Token or Memorial of the new Covenant sealed by, and founded in his Blood; it is a better Foundation to understand our Saviour in this Sense, than any there is to understand him in any other.

The third Thing, which Dr. *Warren* says, is assumed by our Author in his Paraphrase; that is either precarious or false, being Part of his eighth Proposition, I shall consider what he has objected to it under that.

I shall take no Notice of the Complaint made by Dr. *Brett*, from p. 27. to 34. and Dr. *Warren*, p. 2. that our Author only says, that *Christ's* Body was broken for our Good, and his Blood shed to confirm the Covenant, which he declared to Men; and that he no where says, that *Christ* died for the Remission or Forgiveness of our Sins; as this relates to another Controversy; and as the Point now in Dispute did not require him expressly to mention it; and for his not doing which therefore there is no Reason for his Adversaries to charge him with denying it, and consequently they have acted unfairly in so doing.

VIII. It appears from these *Passages* that the End for which our Lord instituted this Duty, was the *Remembrance* of himself; that the Bread to be taken and eaten, was appointed to be the  
*Memorial*

*Memorial* of his *Body* broken: and the *Wine* to be drunk, was ordained to be the *Memorial* of his *Blood* shed: Or, (according to the express Words of *St. Paul*) that the one was to be eaten, and the other drunk in REMEMBRANCE of *Christ*; and this to be continued, until he, who was once *present* with his Disciples, and is now *absent*, shall come again.

To the first Part of this Proposition, which affirms, that the Remembrance of *Christ* is the End and Design of this Holy Rite, Dr. *Warren* objects, "that here our Author seems to him to  
" mistake one of the Parts of this Holy Rite  
" for the End, and that the Remembrance of  
" *Christ* is not the End of it." But it is so plainly affirmed in the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, that the Remembrance of *Christ* is the End of it, that it is wonderful how any one could think or assert the contrary. For when *Christ* took Bread and Wine, called them his Body and Blood, and gave them to his Disciples to eat and drink, and then said, *This do*, thus eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of me, it is most evident, that the End, for which he commanded them thus to eat Bread and drink Wine, was the Remembrance of himself. This is so plain, that nothing can be said to make it plainer. For is it not most evident, that when any Thing is commanded to be done in Remembrance of any Person, the Remembrance of that Person is the End, for which it is commanded to be done? But then our Author does not mean, that the Remembrance of *Christ* is the only End of the Lord's Supper; for he plainly says, p. 138, 139. that there are other Ends served by it;  
" that it naturally tends to revive and keep alive  
" in



64 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ in our Minds all such Thoughts, Dispositions  
 “ and Tendencies, as are proper to work upon  
 “ the Conduct of our whole Lives; to procure  
 “ us the present Favour of God, and entitle us  
 “ finally to his Favour in Heaven; and to ren-  
 “ der us fit for all such Assistances, as are pro-  
 “ per for God to give to free and reasonable  
 “ Creatures.” Now as the Lord’s Supper natu-  
 rally tends to produce all these, they are cer-  
 tainly Ends designed to be produced by it.  
 But the Meaning of our Author is, as it is ex-  
 pressed after his eleventh Proposition; That the  
 Remembrance of *Christ* is the *primary* and *peculiar*  
 End of the Lord’s Supper; as it is designed to  
 cause us first to call *Christ* to our Remembrance  
 in a serious and solemn Manner; and that those  
 other Things are the Ends of the Lord’s Supper;  
 as this serious and solemn Remembrance of *Christ*  
 tends to produce them. The Remembrance of  
*Christ* is so the *primary* and *peculiar* End of par-  
 taking of the Lord’s Supper, as to distinguish it  
 from all other Duties with respect to its End. It  
 is the *primary* and *peculiar* End of no other Duty  
 to cause us to call *Christ* to our Remembrance in  
 such a particular, serious and solemn Manner.  
 This is the Sense of our Author, when he says,  
 That the Remembrance of *Christ* is the End of  
 the Lord’s Supper; and not what his Adversaries  
 charge upon him, that it is a *bare* Remembrance  
 only, which is to have no Influence and Effect to-  
 wards producing any good End or Purpose. And  
 here I shall observe once for all, that, whenever  
 the Adversaries of our Author bring any Argu-  
 ments against him, founded upon the Supposition,  
 that he teaches, that the Remembrance of *Christ*  
 in the Lord’s Supper is to be a bare Remem-  
 brance

brance only; and the Bread and Wine to be bare empty Signs and Memorials only of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, without any such Life and Spirit in them, as to be designed for, or tending to serve any good End and Purpose, such Arguments are of no Force, as being founded upon a false Supposition.

Our Author affirms next in this Proposition, that the Bread to be taken and eaten, was appointed to be the *Memorial* of *Christ's* Body broken; and the Wine to be drunk, was ordained to be the *Memorial* of his Blood shed. By which he means, that the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ* only as they are appointed to be the Signs and Memorials of them, to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of his Body broken, and his Blood shed.

In Opposition to this his Adversaries say, That the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, not only as they are Signs and Memorials of them; but as they convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Body being broken, and his Blood shed for Mankind.

Dr. Brett says, That the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ* in a virtual energetical Sense, in Spirit and in Power. In which Words I suppose, that in a virtual energetical Sense, and in Spirit and in Power are synonymous Expressions, and that what is signified by virtual and energetical is contained in Spirit and in Power, and it appears from what the Doctor says, that, when he calls the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Spirit and in Power, he means, that they are so in the same Sense, in which St. John the Baptist was *Elias* in Spirit and in Power.

F Now

66 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

^ their

Now St. *John* was called *Elias* in Spirit and in Power, because of the Resemblance there was between the two Prophets in Persons, and in their Errands; that they were both Men of rigid and austere Lives, were both eminent Prophets, superior to those of the same Character in their own Age; both came to turn Men from Idolatry and Wickedness to the Worship of the true God, and the Practice of Righteousness; and both preached very efficaciously, and wrought a great Reformation in that respect. This is the Sense, in which St. *John* is called *Elias* in Spirit and in Power; and then, when the Doctor calls the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the same Sense, it is because of the Resemblance there is between them; and I think his Meaning must be, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, because they are there used, or there eat and drunk for the same End, that *Christ's* Body was broken, and his Blood shed, and that they are, when worthily eat and drunk, as efficacious to obtain it. Now we know, that *Christ's* Body was broken, and his Blood shed to obtain for Men the Pardon of their Sins, and eternal Life; and that they will certainly procure these for all those, who perform the Conditions of the Gospel Covenant; and therefore hence it follows, that the Bread and Wine are used in the Lord's Supper to obtain for Men the Pardon of their Sins, and eternal Life, and that they will certainly procure these to all those, who worthily eat and drink them; or, in other Words, that they are used in the Lord's Supper to procure or convey to Men the Benefits of *Christ's* Death.

Mr. *Bowyer* says, Prop. 1. That the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are



## of the LORD'S SUPPER.

are Means of conveying all the Benefits of *Christ's* Passion. Dr. *Warren* says, p. 37. that they are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are the Means to convey to the worthy Receivers the Benefits of his Death and Sufferings; and p. 52. that the Words of the *Institution*, wherein the Bread is so emphatically called his *Body*, and the Wine his *Blood*, do easily lead us to the Expectation of their being what they are called, in the Sense of their conveying to the Soul a Supply of *Strength* and *Refreshment* in Analogy to that *Nourishment* they naturally give the Body; and since the Cup is so expressly called *the Blood of the New Covenant*, it may justly be thought to be a Means of applying the *Privileges* and *Benefits* of the Covenant to *worthy Receivers*.

But after all this the Question remains, how do the Bread and Wine procure, convey, or apply these Benefits to Men, when used in the Lord's Supper? or how do they convey to the Soul a supply of Strength and Refreshment? Do they do this, as, by having some Virtue annexed to them, they convey to the worthy Receivers the Benefits of *Christ's* Death along with themselves, at and by the very Act of receiving them in the Lord's Supper? Or do they convey that Supply of Strength and Nourishment to the Soul by any *Physical* or *material Operation*? Or do they do this, as they are Means appointed by God to convey to the worthy Receivers the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by leading and helping them to such Thoughts, when received in the Lord's Supper, as will confirm them in the Belief of *Christ*, and in an universal Obedience to his Laws, and so secure to them the Benefits of his Death? Or, in other Words, are the Bread and Wine the

## *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Body and Blood of *Christ* in the Lord's Supper, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them, so as that they are conveyed along with the material Elements? Or are they the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the Receivers the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by leading and helping them to such Thoughts, when worthily eat and drunk in the Lord's Supper in Remembrance of *Christ*, as will confirm them in the Belief of *Christ*, and in an universal Obedience to his Laws, and by Consequence secure to them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. The latter of these Senses is that of our Author; the first I take to be that of his Adversaries, excepting one, viz. Mr. *Bowyer*, who seems not to determine in which of the two Senses the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ*. For in his first Proposition he says, "They are Means of conveying (whether *Physically* or *Morally* I do not determine) all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death." Where by *Physically* I understand the Benefits being conveyed by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper along with the material Elements, by physical and material Operation; by *Morally* their being conveyed in a moral Way, by leading and helping Persons to proper Thoughts and Dispositions. So that Mr. *Bowyer*, in proving his first Proposition, does not profess to prove any thing contrary to our Author.

The latter of these Senses is that of our Author so far, as that he acknowledges the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper to be Means of conveying to the Receivers the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by leading and helping them to such Thoughts.

Thoughts, when eat and drunk in the Lord's Supper in Remembrance of *Christ*, as will confirm them in the Belief of *Christ*, and in an universal Obedience to his Laws, and by Consequence secure to them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. Yet he does not say, that they are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to do this. But he says, the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are the *Signs* and *Memorials* of them, to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of *Christ*; and that they are Means to convey to the Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as by their being the *Signs* and *Memorials* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, and being eaten and drunk in Remembrance of him, they lead and help Persons to such Thoughts, as will confirm them in the Belief of *Christ*, and in an universal Obedience to his Laws, and by Consequence secure to them all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. So that the greatest Difference between our Author and his Adversaries, as to the Bread and Wine's being the Body and Blood of *Christ*, is, whether they have such a Virtue annexed to them, as to be the Means of conveying to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them along with themselves; or whether they are the Means of conveying to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as by being eaten and drunk as the *Signs* and *Memorials* of the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Remembrance of him, they lead and help Persons to such Thoughts, as will confirm them in the Belief of *Christ*, and in an universal Obedience to his Laws, and by Consequence secure to them all the Benefits of his Death. For were



70 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

they once agreed about this, I do not suppose, they would think it worth while to dispute, whether the Bread and Wine were called the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they were the *Signs* and *Memorials* of them; or as they were Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. Not but that I think they are called the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the Sense of our Author, in Confirmation of which I shall bring an Argument or two in its proper Place. Let us now proceed to see how the Adversaries of our Author prove, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them along with themselves.

Dr. Brett begins to prove this by producing the Testimony of the Fathers. The Fathers he cites are St. Cyprian, Origen, Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Now of these St. Cyprian calls the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper *the Body and Blood of Christ*; Origen calls the Bread *the Body of the Lord*; Justin Martyr calls the Bread *the Flesh*, and the Wine the *Blood of Jesus*; Ignatius says, that the *Eucharist is the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ*. But now how is it proved from these Fathers calling the Bread and Wine the *Body and Blood* and the *Flesh of Christ* in the Lord's Supper, that they are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving, any more than they were proved to be so by *Christ's* calling them his Body and Blood in the Words of the Institution? *Christ's* calling them  
them

them his Body and Blood in the Words of the Institution shews, that he intended them to be his Body and Blood in some Sense; and so these Fathers calling them the Body and Blood of *Christ* shews, that they believed them to be the Body and Blood of *Christ* in some Sense: But it shews this only in the general, and does not prove in what particular Sense, *Christ* intended them to be, or the Fathers believed them to be, the Body and Blood of *Christ*. And this is all the Doctor himself pretends these Testimonies of the Fathers prove, as appears from what he says p. 40. " Thus we see that the most ancient Fathers of the Christian Church believed the Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist to be in some Sense the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*." But if from their own Words these Fathers appear only to have believed the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist to be the Body and Blood of *Christ* in some Sense; how can the Doctor from their Testimony infer, that they are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them?

*Irenaeus* says, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are *the Communication of the Body and Blood of Christ*; but this does not prove them to be the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the Doctor's Sense, any more than that Passage of *St. Paul*, 1 Cor. x. proves them to be so; and whether that Passage proves it shall be considered presently. *Tertullian* says, that *Christ* made the Bread *his Body*, that is, *the Figure of his Body*. But to say, that the Bread is the Body of *Christ*, as it is the Figure of his Body, is to call it the Body

## 72 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

of *Christ* in the same Sense, in which our Author allows it to be so, and is a plainer Testimony in Favour of his Opinion, than any, which is brought from the Fathers in Favour of the Sense of his Adversaries. For one thing can no otherwise be said to be the *Figure* of another, than as it is the *Sign* and *Representation* of it, is appointed and designed to signify and represent it to us; if therefore the Bread be the *Figure* of *Christ's* Body, it is the *Sign* and *Representation* of it, <sup>is</sup> appointed and designed to signify and represent it to us. And this is what our Author means, when he calls the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper the *Memorials* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*; that they are the *Signs* and *Representations* of them, appointed and designed to signify and represent them to us, to be eaten and drunk by us in Remembrance of *Christ*, to bring into our Minds the Remembrance, that *Christ's* Body was broken and his Blood shed for our Sakes.

The Doctor farther says, " That he cannot  
 " think that when *Christ* called the Bread and  
 " Wine his Body and Blood, he intended they  
 " should be so, only as they were to be Signs,  
 " Representations, and Memorials of them, to  
 " be eat and drunk in Remembrance of him;  
 " so as that for them to be eat and drunk in Re-  
 " membrance of *Christ* was the only End and  
 " Design of the Institution; because St. *Matt.*  
 " and St. *Mark*, say nothing of *Christ's* Com-  
 " mand to do this in Remembrance of him, and  
 " he cannot believe they would so far abridge the  
 " History of the Institution, as to omit the only  
 " material Part of it." To this Objection our  
 Author has given a very sufficient Answer in his  
 Book, p. 12, " That from the different Man-  
 " ner



ner of Expression it is evident that the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, even in giving an Account of an *Institution*, which depended entirely upon our Lord's own Declarations, and was to be a standing Rite in the Christian Church, were not superstitiously scrupulous in numbering his Words; nay, nor solicitous to relate the very Words, and those only, which he made use of. Some record fewer Words, and some more: And all plainly think it sufficient to represent exactly the *Intent* of the whole. It was enough to record these Words concerning the Bread, *Take, Eat, This is my Body*; at a Time, when all *Christians* could not but know from the Mouths of the Apostles themselves, that this Rite was to be continued in the Church as a Memorial of *Christ*." To which I shall add, That our Author no where says, that to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of *Christ* is the only End and Design of the Lord's Supper, so as that this Remembrance was designed to be a bare Remembrance only, and to have no Influence or Effect towards producing any good End or Purpose; but that to eat Bread and drink Wine in the Lord's Supper in Remembrance of *Christ* was the *primary, immediate, and peculiar* End of it, that wherein the *peculiar* Nature of this Rite and Duty consists, that which distinguishes it from all other Rites and Duties, without excluding any good Ends and Effects, which this Remembrance was designed, or tended to produce\*.

Again farther, It may as well be concluded, that it is not necessary towards the due Perfor-

\* See. p. 63.

## 74 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

mance of this Rite, *to eat and drink the Bread and Wine*, because St. *Luke* does not say, that *Christ* commanded the Apostles to eat and drink them, tho' St. *Matthew* and St. *Paul*, plainly add that Command, as to conclude, that to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of *Christ* is not the *peculiar* End and Design of this Rite, because St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, do not add *Christ's* Command to do this in Remembrance of him, tho' St. *Luke* and St. *Paul* plainly add it; and it is as good Reasoning in the one Case to say, That as St. *Luke* says nothing of *Christ's* Command to eat the Bread and drink the Wine, it gives us just ground to believe, that it is not necessary towards the due Performance of this Rite, because we cannot believe, he would so far abridge the History of the Institution, as to omit a necessary Part of it; as it is in the other to say, that as St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, say nothing of *Christ's* Command to do this in Remembrance of him, it gives us just ground to believe, that the Remembrance of *Christ* was not the only *peculiar*, and *immediate* End and Design of the Institution; because we cannot believe, they would so far abridge the History of the Institution as to omit so material a Part of it. Therefore this Argument of Dr. *Brett's* against our Author proves too much, and so proves nothing at all.

Dr. *Brett* proceeds next to prove, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey, to the worthy Receivers of them, the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them, from that Passage of St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. x. 16. &c. *The Cup of Blessing,*  
which

which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread, which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? This Text, the Doctor says, he conceives plainly teaches, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of Christ, *virtually, or in Spirit and in Power*, that is, as we have before shewn, if he means any Thing contrary to our Author, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of Christ's Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them. And he begins to prove this by observing, that our Author says, "the Greek Word *κοινωνία* used by the Apostle, and the Word *Communion*, which is *Latin*, both signify a *joint partaking*, or a partaking of something in *common* with others of the same Society. And this *joint partaking* of Christ's Body, and of Christ's Blood, can signify no more, than *eating* his Body and *drinking* his Blood, as a Society of his Disciples." And from this Passage the Doctor argues, as if our Author had therein allowed, that by receiving the Bread and Wine we received all the Benefits of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed, at and by the very Act of receiving the Bread and Wine. For, says the Doctor, "well then, it is granted, that, when we receive the Holy Communion, we do partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, —and what is the Partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, but partaking of all the Benefits of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed?" Why, our Author tells him, what it is to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper; that it is not to partake of all the Benefits of Christ's Body broken and



and Blood shed ; but that it is to partake of, or eat Bread and drink Wine, not as at an ordinary Meal, but as Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, p. 29. or in other Words, that it is to partake of, or eat and drink Bread and Wine considered, as set apart and appointed to be the Memorials of *Christ's* Body and Blood, in order to bring into our Minds, and preserve in us, the Remembrance of *Christ's* Body being broken and his Blood shed for our Sakes ; and that it is no farther a Partaking of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Body broken and Blood shed, than as that Remembrance tends to qualify us to be Partakers of those Benefits, by preserving in us Faith in, and Obedience to *Christ*, which he has made the necessary Conditions of Persons being Partakers of the Benefits of his Sufferings.

This appears to be the Sense of our Author from what he says, when he speaks of the Benefits of receiving the Lord's Supper, as I shall there more fully observe. And therefore when the Doctor says, that our Author affirms the Bread and Wine to be the *bare* Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, the Word *bare* is added by the Doctor, and is no where to be found in our Author. Our Author says indeed, that the Bread and Wine are the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, but not the *bare* Memorials ; so as to be designed only to preserve in Men the *bare* Remembrance of *Christ*, without its tending to serve any good End or Purpose. In this lies the great Difference between the Doctor and our Author ; that the Dr. says, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers the Benefits

of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them ; our Author says, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are appointed to be the Signs and Memorials of them ; and it is no Confutation of this latter Opinion only to affirm the former, without giving any Reason to support that Affirmation, as the Doctor does in his 42<sup>d</sup> and 43<sup>d</sup> Pages ; unless it be called a Reason to say, That all learned Men, except *Papists* and *Socinians*, interpret the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* in this Passage according to that Sense. By all learned Men, I suppose the Doctor means all those learned Men, who have published their Interpretation of this Passage to the World. But as all these learned Men may be mistaken, their bare Authority without Arguments produced to prove their Interpretations to be true, which is not here done by the Doctor, is not a sufficient Reason to support that Affirmation. And there may have been as many, and as learned Men, who have interpreted this Passage in a different Manner, who have not thought fit to make their Interpretations publick.

The Doctor goes on, " If the Meaning of " *St. Paul* had been, that we eat and drink Bread " and Wine in the Lord's Supper, as Memorials " of the Body and Blood of *Christ* ; how comes " he then in this Place to say not one Word of " Memorial or Remembrance ?" To which I answer by another Question, If the Meaning of *St. Paul* had been, that we eat Bread and drink Wine in the Lord's Supper, as they are Means to convey to us the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of eating and drinking them ; How comes he then in this Place to say not one Word

## 78 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Word of Benefits? And this Question is as good a Confutation of the Doctor's Opinion, as the Doctor's Question is of the Sense of our Author. *St. Paul* might mean either without saying a Word either of Memorial or Benefits; and which of the two Senses he did mean, can be known only by finding out the true Sense of *St. Paul* in this Passage, by interpreting the Words here used by him in a Sense most agreeable to that, in which they are used in other Places, and to the Scope and Design of the Apostle here. And to find out this Sense we will now proceed; and if upon this Enquiry it shall appear, that this Passage may be fairly and naturally interpreted without including, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them; and without contradicting that they are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are the Signs, Representations, and Memorials of them; then I presume, that it cannot be proved from this Passage, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the former Sense; nor that they are not the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the latter.

Our Author interprets this Passage of *St. Paul* to this Effect; "When we *Christians* partake in  
 " common of the Cup of Blessing, do we not  
 " partake of it, as Wine appointed to be a Memorial of the Blood of *Christ*? Is it not therefore in its plain Design the jointpartaking (or  
 " Communion) of that, which brings to Remembrance, and in this Institution is called  
 " his Blood? When in the same Solemnity we  
 " break



“ break and eat Bread, is not this the joint-  
 “ partaking (or Communion) of that, which  
 “ is appointed to be the Remembrance of his  
 “ Body, and is therefore by him called his  
 “ Body, and not eating Bread as at a common  
 “ Meal? By which Partaking of one Bread as  
 “ one Company, we acknowledge ourselves to be  
 “ one Body or Society, devoted and subject to  
 “ *Christ*, as our common Head, Master, or Go-  
 “ vernor, whose Will and Commands we ac-  
 “ knowledge to be the Rule of our Actions, and  
 “ ourselves willing and ready to obey them. In  
 “ the same Manner amongst the *Jews*, the Per-  
 “ sons, who eat any Part of what had been sa-  
 “ crificed upon the Altar of the true God, by  
 “ this Act profess and own themselves to be his  
 “ People and Worshippers of him, and obedient  
 “ to his Will. When I apply this to the Hea-  
 “ thens around you, and the Sacrifices of their  
 “ Idols, I do not mean to affirm, that the Idols  
 “ in their Temples are any real Beings; (that  
 “ is, as to their being Gods, or any real Gods,  
 “ as it is expressed, Chap. viii. 4. *We know that*  
 “ *an Idol is nothing in the World*, nothing of a  
 “ God, *and that there is none other real God but*  
 “ *one*: Or, as to their having any Understand-  
 “ ing and Will, and being capable to be Mas-  
 “ ters, and to have Persons servants and obedi-  
 “ ent to them. For it cannot be imagined, that  
 “ our Author did not know, that a Stock or a  
 “ Stone has as much a real Existence, as the most  
 “ perfect intelligent Being; nor by Consequence  
 “ that he intended to affirm, that the Idols had  
 “ no real Existence,) or that what they sa-  
 “ crifice to them is in Truth, different from  
 “ common Flesh. But this I say, that the *Idea-*  
 “ *thens*

80 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ *thens* themselves certainly think of these Of-  
 “ ferings and intend them, as Sacrifices (not to  
 “ nothing, as to *Reason and Understanding*, not  
 “ solely and ultimately to those Idols, which have  
 “ no intelligent Nature) but to some real Beings,  
 “ to some Beings, which, tho’ they are not really  
 “ Gods, yet are really intelligent, and capable of  
 “ being Masters, and having Persons Servants and  
 “ obedient to them, which Beings are *Dæmons*,  
 “ to whom they imagine them to be acceptable,  
 “ and whom they honour as Gods, and own them  
 “ to be their Head and Masters, and profess them-  
 “ selves their Subjects and Servants, devoted to  
 “ and ready to obey their Will. Upon this Ac-  
 “ count I would not that ye should be joint *Par-*  
 “ *takers*, or appear to be *Communicants* with the  
 “ *Heathens* around you, by eating of those  
 “ Things in common with them, which have  
 “ been sacrificed in religious Honour to those  
 “ supposed *Dæmons*; because you would thereby  
 “ appear to pay Honour to, and be Worshippers  
 “ of *Dæmons*, to own them as your Head and  
 “ Master, and yourselves to be their Subjects  
 “ and Servants, in Derogation to the Honour of  
 “ the true God, and much to the Prejudice of  
 “ his Service.

“ This Behaviour cannot be justified, and is  
 “ very contradictory in you, who are the Disci-  
 “ ples of *Christ*; whereby you are obliged to dis-  
 “ courage that Worship of *Dæmons*, which  
 “ *Christ* came to destroy, which by thus eating  
 “ Things offered to Idols you encourage, and  
 “ thereby are guilty of a great Crime; and as  
 “ you are the Disciples of *Christ*, you are like-  
 “ wise to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remem-  
 “ brance of him, by which Action you profess  
 “ yourselves

“ yourselves his Disciples and Servants; to  
 “ which it is inconsistent to eat of Things offered  
 “ to Idols, professing yourselves by that Action  
 “ to be Disciples and Servants of *Demons*.  
 “ This Behaviour of yours must certainly be very  
 “ inconsistent to profess yourselves to be Servants  
 “ of two Masters, whose Wills and Commands  
 “ are so opposite, as those of *Christ* and *Satan*;  
 “ and it is impossible for you to be, what by  
 “ these Actions you appear, and in common  
 “ Construction are supposed to be.”

To confute this Interpretation Dr. *Brett* first brings the Authority of St. *Cbrysoftom*, who interprets those Words of St. *Paul*, *The Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* to signify, that by eating of the Bread in the Lord's Supper, Persons are united to *Christ*. By thus interpreting these Words, St. *Cbrysoftom* cannot mean, that by eating Bread in the Lord's Supper, Persons by that very Act are united to *Christ*, because that is impossible. To be united to *Christ*, or to be in Union with him, is to be of the same Society and Fellowship with him, to be his true and sincere Servants and Subjects, and to have him for their Head and Lord, and to have the Holy Ghost dwelling in them. But no Person can be thus united to *Christ*, except he be a true and sincere *Christian*, and therefore no Person can be united to *Christ* by eating Bread in the Lord's Supper, except he be a true and sincere *Christian* before he eat it; and if he be a true and sincere *Christian* before he eat the Bread in the Lord's Supper, he is also united to *Christ* before he eats that Bread; for every true and sincere *Christian* is united to *Christ*; and therefore he cannot be united to *Christ* by the very Act of eating



eating that Bread, that Union being made before. And it is impossible for any Thing to be done by any Act, which was actually done before that Act was performed, and was not undone again from that Time of its being done to the Time of performing that Act; and therefore it is impossible, that any Person can be united to *Christ* by the very Act of eating Bread in the Lord's Supper, who was united before the eating of that Bread, and was not disunited from that Time of his being united to the Time of his eating Bread in the Lord's Supper\*. St. *Chrysostom* therefore by thus interpreting these Words must mean, either that, by eating Bread in the Lord's Supper, Persons declare themselves to be united to or in Union with *Christ*, or that, by eating Bread in the Lord's Supper, Persons are caused to be or preserved, in that Union; and then he says nothing different from our Author. For in his Interpretation of this Passage of St. *Paul* he says, that by partaking of the Lord's Supper, Persons declare themselves to be one Body and Society with *Christ*, and devoted and subject to him, which is the same, as to be united to, or in Union with him; and in speaking of the Benefits of the Lord's Supper he says, that it tends to cause, or preserve and continue, Persons to be the true Servants and Disciples of *Christ*; and by consequence in Union with him.

Dr. *Brett* next proceeds to shew the Falseness of our Author's Interpretation from the Design of the Apostle in this Passage; which he says is, as our Author also observes, "To incite the *Corinthians* to flee from Idolatry, by shewing them, what a Crime it must be in a *Christian* to do, what was accounted Honour to the Gods of the *Heathens* by feasting upon and partaking

\* See farther under this Prop.

“ of their Sacrifices.” And the Doctor says nothing, but that, if this was the sole Design of the Apostle in this Passage, our Author's Interpretation of it is right: but he says our Author's Interpretation of it cannot be true, because “ St. Paul speaks of something more than paying Honour to the Gods of the Heathens by partaking of those Sacrifices; that to partake of them was *having Communion* with Devils. — And to have Communion with Devils the Doctor says, is to become liable to the same Condemnation with Devils;” and thence he infers, that to have Communion with the Body and Blood of *Christ* is to be entitled to all the Benefits purchased by the Death of *Christ*. And had the Doctor well proved, that to have Communion with Devils was to become liable to the same Condemnation with them, it would from thence follow, that to have Communion with the Body and Blood of *Christ*, was to be entitled to the Happiness purchased by his Death. But the Doctor has by no Means proved the former of these two Propositions. The first Reason, he offers in proof of it, is, that to have Communion with the Body and Blood of *Christ* is to be entitled to the Benefits of his Death, and therefore to have Communion with Devils, is to become liable to the same Condemnation with Devils. This Argument of the Doctor's is contained in these Words, p. 45. “ The Apostle's Argument to convince them of the Sin of Idolatry runs thus; *In the Lord's Supper you communicate of the Body and Blood of Christ, and so are entitled to all the Benefits by the breaking of his Body, and the Effusion of his Blood: in the Gentile Sacrifices you communicate with Devils, and so become* *liable* *purchased*”

84 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*“ liable to the same Condemnation with Devils.”*

But is not this plainly to run round in a Circle proving *Idem per Idem*? that to have Communion with the Body and Blood of *Christ* is to be entitled to the Benefits of his Death, because to have Communion with Devils is to become liable to the same Condemnation with Devils; and that to have Communion with Devils is to become liable to the same Condemnation with Devils, because to have Communion with the Body and Blood of *Christ* is to be entitled to the Benefits of his Death!

The Doctor's next Argument to prove, that the Communion of the Body and Blood of *Christ* signifies to partake of all the Benefits of his Death, is taken from those Words, *Ye cannot drink of the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.* From these Words the Doctor argues thus, “ That except by eating  
“ Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table,  
“ Persons were made Partakers of the Benefits of  
“ *Christ's* Death; and by eating at the Table of  
“ Devils, Persons became liable to the same  
“ Condemnation with Devils, the Apostle's Reasoning loses its Force, and he could not say,  
“ *Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table,*  
“ *and of the Table of Devils;*” that is, that this Assertion would not be true. But why would it not be true, tho' we interpret the Communion of the Body and Blood of *Christ* to signify a Partaking of Bread and Wine as Representations and Memorials of *Christ's* Body and Blood in Remembrance of him; and thereby professing themselves his Disciples and Servants; and the Communion of Devils to signify, professing



sing themselves to be Disciples and Servants of Devils by partaking of Meats offered to Idols? Why, says the Doctor, "Because then Persons might come to and eat at both the Table of the Lord, and the Table of Devils, which, St. Paul says, they cannot do." It is true indeed, that, according to this latter Interpretation of St. Paul's Words, Persons might in *Fact* come to and eat at both Tables; but then they could not do so without being guilty of a great Crime, and acting in a Manner contradictory and inconsistent with Truth. It must be a very great Crime in Persons, who are Disciples of *Christ*, and publickly and openly profess themselves to be so by eating and drinking at his Table in Remembrance of him, openly and publickly to profess themselves to be Disciples of Devils, by eating at their Table, whose Interest and Design is directly opposite to that of *Christ*, and whose Worship and Power he came to destroy; which Worship and Power Persons encourage and advance by openly professing themselves their Disciples by eating at their Tables. And this Behaviour of coming to the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils is also very contradictory and inconsistent with Truth. For thereby they profess themselves to be Servants, and obedient to two Masters, whose Wills and Commands are directly opposite to each other, and both whom they cannot serve and obey. And therefore they cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils consistently with Truth, without professing themselves to be, what in Truth and Reality they cannot be. And this is sufficient to answer the Apostle's saying, *Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of*

## 86 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Devils*, and sufficiently preserves the Force of his Reasoning. For there is no Occasion to interpret *St. Paul* as speaking here of an absolute Impossibility; but it is enough to understand him, as saying, That to partake of the Lord's Table and of the Table of Devils could not be done without a very great Crime, and consistently with Truth.

Thus have I considered the Reasons given by *Dr. Brett* to prove that this Passage of *St. Paul* plainly teaches, that by eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Supper, Persons are made Partakers of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death at and by the very Act of eating and drinking them; and shewn them to be insufficient to prove this.

P. 34. Our Author says, "I find these Words  
 " — *The Cup—*which we bless, is it not the  
 " *Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread,*  
 " *which we break, is it not the Communion of the*  
 " *Body of Christ?* interpreted by many learned  
 " Men to signify a *Communion*, or partaking of  
 " *all the Benefits* of *Christ's Body* broken and  
 " *Blood shed*; a Point which, it seems to me, *St.*  
 " *Paul* could not have in his Thoughts, as at all  
 " proper for his present Argument. On the  
 " contrary I think, that the Words, here made  
 " use of, cannot have this Signification; and  
 " that in this Place particularly, *St. Paul's* Ar-  
 " gument neither requires it, nor admits of it."

In Opposition to this, *Dr. Warren* says, p. 69. That he "shall undertake to shew, that the  
 " *Apostle's Argument* does not only allow us to  
 " suppose, that *Benefits and Blessings* may be im-  
 " parted to us by the *Communion* of our Saviour's  
 " *Body and Blood* here mentioned, but that it re-  
 " ceives great *Strength and Weight* from the Sup-  
 " sition,

“ position, nay, that it does moreover absolutely  
“ require it.”

1. “ That the *Apostle's Argument* does not  
“ only allow us to suppose, that *Benefits and*  
“ *Blessings* may be imparted to us by the *Com-*  
“ *munion* of our Saviour's *Body and Blood* here  
“ mentioned, but that it receives great Strength  
“ and Weight from the Supposition.”

Concerning which Proposition I shall observe  
first, That it is nothing to the Purpose to shew,  
that the Apostle's Argument allows us to suppose,  
that Benefits and Blessings *may* be imparted by  
the Communion of our Saviour's Body and Blood  
here mentioned; but the Point to the Purpose,  
which ought to be proved, is, that the Apostle's Ar-  
gument here implies, that he intends to signify by  
the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* an  
imparting and partaking of Benefits and Blessings.  
For Benefits and Blessings *may* be imparted by the  
Lord's Supper, and yet the Apostle's Argument  
here may not imply, that he intends to signify by  
*the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*  
an imparting and partaking of Benefits and Bles-  
sings. And if the Apostle's Argument here does  
not imply this; it is not proved, that *the Com-*  
*munion of the Body and Blood of Christ* here sig-  
nifies a *Communion*, or partaking of the *Benefits of*  
*Christ's Body* broken, and *Blood* shed, by proving  
that these Benefits are imparted by receiving the  
Lord's Supper. Let us see then, whether what  
Dr. Warren here says, proves, that the Apostle's  
Argument here implies, that he intends to signify  
by *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* an  
imparting and partaking of Benefits and Blessings.

The Doctor endeavours to prove this by dis-  
proving our Author's Paraphrase upon this Pas-  
sage of St. Paul; and to disprove this he says,



88 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ That our Author has taken for granted, without any Manner of Proof, several Particulars, upon the supposed Truth of which the whole Argument of his *Paraphrase* upon this *Passage* rests, which are yet, all of them, not only disputable, but false.”

The first of these Particulars is, That our Author “ understands the Word *κοινωνία* (Communion) when applied to the *Body and Blood of* Christ in the Sense of partaking of them with this single *Effect*, that the Receivers do thereby declare themselves Members of that Society, of which he is the Head.” The Sense of which Words of the Doctor I think must be this, that our Author understands the *κοινωνία*, or Communion of the *Body and Blood of* Christ, to signify, in this Place, a partaking of the Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper with this single *Effect*, that the Receivers of them do thereby declare themselves Members of that Society, of which he is the Head. And if he means, that our Author understands this to be the only *Effect* of receiving them, implied in the Apostle’s Argument here, it may be true; but if he means, that our Author understands this to be the only *Effect* of receiving them at all; that the partaking of them tends to produce no other *Effect*, it is not true; because our Author plainly teaches the contrary in his Book. If therefore the Doctor intends to assert here, what is true, he must mean, that our Author understands *the declaring themselves Members of that Society, of which Christ is the Head*, is the only Effect of Persons receiving Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper implied in the Apostle’s Argument in this Place.

To shew this to be false, the Doctor says, that *κοινωνία*, or "Communion—usually signifies in  
 " other Parts of Scripture, a *Participation* of  
 " somewhat with real and beneficial Effects, and  
 " not a Badge and Token of Membership only." And if *κοινωνία* in this Place does signify a *Participation* of any Thing, as a *Participation* of the Bread and Wine, it signifies the *Participation* of somewhat with real and beneficial Effects. For the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, when worthily received, are attended with real and beneficial Effects, they are really beneficial to the Receivers of them. But notwithstanding this it might not be the Design of St. Paul in his Argument here to represent the partaking of the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper in this View; but only as a *Badge* or *Token of Membership*, or of their being in Fellowship and Society with Christ.

2. But secondly, this Observation of the Doctor's is without Foundation. For tho' in the Places cited by him to prove this Observation, *κοινωνία* does signify to partake of some Benefit; yet this proceeds not from any Thing peculiar in the Sense of the Word *κοινωνία*, as he would insinuate to his Readers, but because it is there applied to Objects, which are good and beneficial to Men. And tho' he says, that more Passages might be cited to the same Purpose; yet he cannot produce one more Passage to the same Purpose, where *κοινωνία* is used to signify a Participation or Joint-partaking of any Thing, which is good and beneficial to Men; and there is one Place, *Phil. iii. 10.* where it signifies a Participation of what is evil and hurtful to Men, which is Persecutions and Afflictions, expressed in these

these Words, *the Fellowship of his Sufferings*; again, *Eph. v. 11. Have no Fellowship with the unfruitful Works of Darkneſs*; where *συκοινωνεῖτε* (which being derived from the ſame Theme with *κοινωνία*, the Senſe of them both muſt be the ſame, allowing for the Difference of one's being a Verb, and the other a Noun) is uſed to ſignify the Fellowship with, or partaking of that, which is evil *viz. the unfruitful Works of Darkneſs*. And if it be the *peculiar* Senſe of *κοινωνία*, to ſignify the Participation of ſomething which is good and beneficial to Men, it muſt alſo be the *peculiar* Senſe of *κοινωνέω* and its Compounds to ſignify the ſame; which it plainly is not, except St. Paul has here uſed the Word *συκοινωνεῖτε* improperly.

The Word *κοινωνία* is uſed in the New Teſtament in the following Places, beſides thoſe in Diſpute, 2 *Corinth. vi. 14. and xiii. 14. Ephes. iii. 9. Philip. ii. 1. and iii. 10. Acts ii. 42. 1 Corinth. i. 9. 2 Corinth. viii. 4. Galat. ii. 9. Philip i. 5. 1 John i. 3. twice, and vi. 7.* In the firſt of theſe it is not Man's Participation of any Thing, which is mentioned; in the three next, which are thoſe cited by the Doctor, *κοινωνία* ſignifies a partaking of what is good and beneficial to Men; in the next Place it ſignifies a Participation of what is evil and hurtful; in the nine laſt Places, *κοινωνία* doth not ſignify a Participation of any Thing, but a *Fellowſhip, Partnership, Company* or *Society*, in which Perſons, either as Head or Maſter, and Members, Diſciples or Servants; or as Fellow Members and Fellow-Subjects united under the ſame Head or Maſter; or as Companions, are joined together, and aiding and aſſiſting each other, or as one only aſſiſting the other, in the ſame Undertaking, or in the

Parti-



Participation of the same Things, whether good or evil.

If any Commentators have interpreted *κοινωνία* in any of these nine last Places to signify *Communion* or *Participation*, there certainly does not appear to be any Reason for their interpreting of it in that Sense; but the Sense of those Passages is much more easy and natural, if *κοινωνία* be translated *Fellowship*, as the Translators of the New Testament have rendered it, in some of the Senses of *Fellowship* just mentioned. And tho' I have allowed, *κοινωνία* to signify in some Places a *Participation* of somewhat; yet I am inclined to think it signifies in those Places the same as in the nine last, in some of the Senses here mentioned. For the proper Sense of *κοινωνία* seems to be a *Communion* or *Fellowship*, and not a *Partaking* or *Joint-partaking*, which both signify the same. For *Partaking* signifies to take or have a Part of a Thing, of which others also take or have a Part; and a *Joint-partaking* signifies no more. And tho' *κοινωνία* may perhaps be sometimes used to signify a *Partaking*; yet St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. seems to use it in its proper Signification. For when he speaks of a bare *Partaking*, *ἡ 21.* he uses the Word *μετέχειν*, and not *κοινωνία*. And this Sense of *κοινωνία* is confirmed by the Use of it in profane Authors, particularly by *Aristotle* in his *Ethics*, Lib. vi. Edit. Oxon. 1716. p. 195, 213. and in other Places; and Lib. viii. p. 361. and in other Places. And p. 215, 220. *κοινωνοί* and *κοινωνῶν* signify Persons, who are Companions, and in Society or Fellowship with others.

2. “ The next exceptionable Particular of  
“ your Paraphrase, says the Doctor, is, that you  
“ take for granted, that the Apostle by this Ex-  
“ pression,

92 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“*pression, Are not they, which eat of the Sa-*  
 “*crifices, Partakers of the Altar?* means no more  
 “*than that they, who eat of the Sacrifices offered*  
 “*to the true God, did thereby profess themselves*  
 “*his Worshippers, as truly, as if they had them-*  
 “*selves offered the Sacrifices upon the Altar.*  
 “Whereas it is evident the Apostle must mean,  
 “that they were thereby Partakers of all the Be-  
 “nefits that accrued to the *Jews* from the  
 “Worship of the true God.”

To prove this the Doctor says, “That the  
 “Altar was the great Means or Instrument of  
 “conveying to the *Jews* the Benefits of their  
 “being in Covenant with God.—And that  
 “the *eating of the Sacrifices* was the Means to  
 “the People of their receiving the Benefits ex-  
 “pected from the Altar.” Now both these Rea-  
 sons are taken for granted without any Manner of  
 Proof. The Altar could no otherwise be the  
 Means of conveying to the *Jews* the Benefits of  
 their being in Covenant with God, than by Sacri-  
 fices being offered upon it; and then it is not so  
 much the Altar, as the Sacrifices, which are these  
 Means. And tho’ the People are allowed to eat  
 of the Peace-offerings, yet there is not the least  
 Intimation in Scripture; nor by consequence any  
 Reason to believe, that the People received the  
 Benefits, even of those Peace-offerings, much less  
 of the other Offerings, or any other Part of their  
 Religion, by the very Act of eating of those Sa-  
 crifices. But supposing the eating of these Sa-  
 crifices was a Means to the People of their re-  
 ceiving the Benefits of their Religion; yet as it  
 was also a *Badge* or *Token* of their *Fellowship* with  
 God, St. Paul in his Argument here might de-  
 sign

sign to represent it only in this latter View, and not at all in the former.

3, The third Particular, which the Doctor says our Author takes for granted in his Paraphrase, is, " that the *Devils* here mentioned should be " translated *Demons* in the Sense of *inferior* " *Gods*, and not wicked Spirits, the Devil and " his Angel." But with regard to this I shall say nothing, as I do not see how it at all alters the Case, or makes for one Side or the other of the present Dispute, whether *Δαιμονία* be translated in the one Sense or the other.

The Doctor next proceeds to express his Astonishment at our Author's saying, that the Apostles Argument here does not admit those Words, *The Cup, — which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread, which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* To be used to signify a *Communion* or partaking of all the Benefits of *Christ's Body* broken and *Blood shed*. " I cannot, says he, but " think it somewhat extraordinary, that you " will not allow the Notion of Benefits conferred in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to " be so much as consistent with this Argument " of *St. Paul*; — If this Supposition gives " *not Strength* to the Argument, I cannot, for " my Heart, see how it abates the Force of it; " and if it should be allowed, that the Conclusion would be good *without it*, yet certainly " the Argument can never be hurt or weakened " by it."

Our Author does not say, that this Supposition is inconsistent with, or abates the Force of, or weakens the Apostles Argument here; but only that his Argument does not admit of it, in the



94 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the Sense that he does not here argue at all from that Supposition ; that it is no Part of the Argument, he here makes use of. And for this he gives a plain Reason, viz<sup>a</sup>. Because it was not at all to the Purpose of the Apostle to say or suppose, that by eating *Bread* and drinking *Wine* in the *Lord's Supper* you partake of all the *Benefits* of *Christ's Death* ; that this did not at all help to prove, what he aimed at. But since the Truth of this Reason seems not to be fully apprehended, I shall endeavour to set it in a more full and clear Light.

The Design of the Apostle here may indeed be said to be, to perswade the *Corinthians* to flee from Idolatry ; but the particular Act of Idolatry, which he would dissuade them from, was that of eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple. This the *Corinthians* thought was not Idolatry. And therefore the Design of the Apostle here may more properly be said to be, to dissuade the *Corinthians* from this Practice, by proving to them, that it was Idolatry. Now Idolatry consists in owning some other Being as God besides the true God ; in doing any Thing, which implies our owning and professing that Being to be our Head and Master, and ourselves devoted to, and ready to obey its Will, and to be Disciples and Servants of it ; and not in receiving any Influences from those false Gods. And to prove, that to eat Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple was Idolatry, the Apostle makes use of those two Instances of *Christians* eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table, and of the *Jews* eating of their Sacrifices. And therefore

<sup>a</sup> Page 36. of the *Plain Account*.

what he says of those two Actions must be interpreted in such a Sense, as for them to be fit *Mediums* to prove that to eat Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple was Idolatry; and this Sense plainly is, that by those two Actions the *Christians* and *Jews* owned, or did what was a Profession of *Christ* and God to be their God; by which they owned and professed them to be their Head and Master, and themselves devoted to and ready to obey their Wills. This Sense tends plainly and directly to prove, that the *Corinthians* by eating Meats offered to the Idols in the Idol Temple were guilty of Idolatry; that they thereby owned some other Being than the true God to be their God; owned and professed it to be their Head and Master, and themselves devoted to and ready to obey its Will. But it does not prove this to say, that *Christians*, by eating Bread and drinking Wine in the Lord's Supper, are Partakers of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, and the *Jews* by eating of their Sacrifices were Partakers of the Benefits of their Religion. This proves only that by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, they were Partakers of what the false Gods, to whose Honour those Idols were made, bestowed upon Men; but this was not the Point to be proved. And hence it appears, that the Supposition of Benefits conferred in the Lord's Supper, gives no Manner of *Weight* or Force to the Argument of the Apostle here towards proving what he intended to prove, because this Supposition does not at all tend to prove it; and therefore that his Argument here did not admit of that Supposition for the Reason given by our Author, p. 36. that it was not at all to his Purpose to suppose

suppose it; and it did not at all help to prove, what he aimed at.

Dr. *Warren*, in order to shew that the Supposition of Benefits gives Weight and Force to the Apostle's Argument here, gives the following Paraphrase of this Passage; " By a joint partaking of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, you profess your Subjection to him and hold *Communion* with him, whereby you are made Partakers of the Benefits of his Death; these Actions therefore, having this Meaning and Effect, as indeed all religious Rites whatsoever are performed in View to some Benefit and Advantage from the Object worshipped, and this is remarkably so, in the Case of the *Jews*, who by eating of the Sacrifices held *Communion* with God, by being made Partakers of all the Expiations of the Altar. These Actions then having this allowed Design and Effect in them, it is not only *absurd* and *inexcusable*, but *Idolatrous* in you to partake with the *Heathens* in feasting upon their Sacrifices, whereby you not only profess Honour to their Gods, but declare your Expectation of Help and Succour from them, whereby you do not only give Encouragement to the *Heathens* to continue in their Idolatry, but do indeed join with them in the Abomination."

In this Paraphrase I suppose the Doctor intends to give the Sense of those Words *to have Fellowship with Devils*, otherwise it is an imperfect Paraphrase, and not fit to propose the Apostle's Argument in its true and just Light, which he professes to do; and I think he has given the Sense of them in those Words, " Whereby you not  
" only



“ only profess Honour to their Gods, but declare  
 “ your Expectation of Help and Succour from  
 “ them ;” and in these Words he has plainly in-  
 terpreted *to have Fellowship with Devils*, to sig-  
 nify only *to profess Honour to them, and to declare*  
*their Expectation of Help and Succour from them.*  
 When therefore the Apostle argues, from *Christi-*  
*ans having Communion with the Body and Blood of*  
*Christ* by eating Bread and drinking Wine at  
 the Lord's Table, and from the *Jews being Par-*  
*takers of the Altar* by eating of the Sacrifices, to  
 shew that the *Corinthians*, by eating Meats offered  
 to Idols in the Idol Temple, had *Fellowship with*  
*Devils*, his Argument only implies, that he  
 should intend to signify by *the Communion of the*  
*Body and Blood of Christ*, and by *Partakers of*  
*the Altar*, professing Honour to *Christ* and to  
 God, and declaring their Expectation of Help  
 and Succour from them ; but not that he should  
 intend to signify a *Communion or Partaking of*  
*Benefits and Blessings.* For to intend to signify  
 only this is sufficient to prove what the Apostle  
 designed to prove here, according to the Sense,  
 which Dr. Warren has in this Paraphrase given to  
 those Words, *to have Fellowship with Devils* ;  
 and therefore there is no Foundation to believe,  
 that he intended to signify more. Neither does  
 the Supposition of his intending to signify that  
*more*, which Dr. Warren supposes him to signify,  
 add any *Weight* and Force to his Argument,  
 which is, that *Benefits are conferred in the Lord's*  
*Supper*, at and by the very Act of receiving it.  
 For all that this can tend to prove, is, that *Be-*  
*nefits or some kind of Influences or another* are  
 conferred, at and by the very Act of eating  
 Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, which

is no Part of what St. Paul designed to prove here, that being only, that by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, Persons *professed Honour to Devils, and declared their Expectation of receiving, and not actually received, Help and Succour, or Benefits, from them.* And thus, according to the Doctor's Paraphrase of this Passage, and his Way of proposing the Apostle's Argument *in its true and just Light*, as he calls it, therein, it appears not to prove, that any Benefits are conferred in the Lord's Supper, but only that, by partaking of it, Persons declared their Expectations of Benefits.

Thus have I shewn, that Dr. Warren has not proved, either that the Apostle's Argument here implies, that he intended to signify, by the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*, a *Communion* or Partaking of Benefits and Blessings, or that it receives any *Weight* or *Force* from the Supposition of Benefits being conferred in the Lord's Supper. Let us now proceed to consider, what he says to prove, that his Argument does absolutely require it.

To prove this he says, That, without the Supposition that the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* signifies the conferring of the Benefits of *Christ's Death*, at and by the very Act of eating the Bread and drinking the Wine in the Lord's Supper, those Words at the 19<sup>th</sup> Ver. *What say I then? That the Idol is any Thing, or that which is offered to Idols is any Thing?* 20. *But I say, that the Things, which the Gentiles, sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, and I would not that you should have Fellowship with Devils;* are not sufficiently accounted for nor explained, that they seem to be quite foreign to the  
Apostle's

Apostle's Argument, and that no Reason can be given, why they are brought in ; and that the Opposition made by the Apostle between the *Idols* in the 19<sup>th</sup> Ver. and the *Devils* mentioned in the 20<sup>th</sup> is not sufficiently expressed and represented.

The contrary to this, I shall endeavour to make appear in the following Representation of the Apostle's Argument in the Sense of our Author, and according to his Interpretation of this Passage.

The Design of St. *Paul* in this Passage is, to dissuade the *Corinthians* from eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, for which Purpose he argues in the following Manner. When we *Christians* eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of *Christ* at the Lord's Table, do we not by that Act profess, and openly shew ourselves to be the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*, own him for our Head and Master, and ourselves obliged and willing to obey his Will ? And that we are also one Body with the whole Assembly of *Christians*, under *Christ* our Head, or of whom *Christ* is the Head ? In like Manner the *Jews*, do not they by eating of the Sacrifices profess and openly shew themselves to be the Disciples and Servants of the true God, to whom the Altar belongs, upon which those Sacrifices were offered, own him for their Head and Master, and themselves obliged and willing to obey his Will ? The Apostle having thus mentioned the two Arguments, which he used to shew the *Corinthians*, that they were guilty of Idolatry by eating Meats offered to the Idols in the Idol Temple, he was next to apply them to that Case of their eating Meats offered to Idols, and shew that it was par-



allel to them, and that by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple they professed and openly shewed themselves to be Disciples and Servants of some Being, which they ought not to be the Disciples and Servants of, that they owned that Being for their Head and Master, and themselves obliged and willing to obey its Will; and thereby were guilty of Idolatry, and did great Prejudice to the Service of *Christ*, by causing Persons, from their Example, to continue thus to profess themselves to be Servants of some other Master, and to be obedient to his Will, and thereby hinder them from being the Servants of, and obedient to *Christ*.

But before the Apostle applies these Arguments to the Case of the *Corinthians*, he answers an Objection, which they might make to his arguing. For the *Corinthians* might reply; Well; and what if *Christians* by eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table do by that Act profess and openly shew themselves to be the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*, own him for their Head and Master, and themselves obliged and willing to obey his Will; and the *Jews* by eating of the Sacrifices profess and openly shew themselves to be the Disciples and Servants of the true God, to whom the Altar belongs upon which those Sacrifices were offered, own him for their Head and Master, and themselves obliged and ready to obey his Will? What can you infer from this against the Practice you condemn in us? You cannot infer, that we, by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, do openly profess and shew ourselves to be Disciples and Servants of any Being, own it for our Head and Master, and ourselves obliged and willing to obey  
its

its Will. For there is nothing in the Idol Temple, which is capable of and can be an Head and Master, which has a Will, and which can have Disciples and Servants, and Persons obliged and willing to obey its Will; except you will say, that the lifeless Idol, made of a Stock or a Stone, is capable of this; for there is nothing in the Idol Temple, but the lifeless Idol, and the lifeless Meat offered to it, of which we can be supposed to profess ourselves to be the Disciples and Servants. But this you cannot say, except you will say, that the lifeless Idol, or the lifeless Meat offered to it, has Understanding and a Will to be obeyed. For nothing, which is not endued with an intelligent Nature, and has a Will, is capable of having Disciples and Servants, of being their Head and Master, and of having Persons under an Obligation, and willing to obey its Will. And therefore we cannot imagine, that by eating Meats offered to Idols, we can profess and openly shew ourselves to be the Disciples and Servants of the lifeless Idol, or the lifeless Meat offered to it; nor that we can be apprehended, or understood by any Persons to do so. Since the Idol and Meat offered to it are not capable of having Disciples and Servants, and it is absolutely impossible for them to have any; and surely we cannot be thought and understood to profess and openly shew ourselves to be, what it is plainly impossible for us to be. And therefore by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, we can do no Prejudice to the Service of *Christ*, nor lessen the Number of his Servants and Disciples; since there is nothing, which either we can profess ourselves to be the Disciples and Servants of, or to be the Disciples and Servants of which, we can

102 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

encourage others by our Example, and thereby hinder them from being the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*; for there is nothing in the Idol Temple, which has any Will, or can give out any Commands to be obeyed, differing from the Commands of *Christ*; and therefore nothing, by obeying the Will of which Persons can be turned away or hindered from obeying the Commands of *Christ*.

*a drinking* To this Objection, which the *Corinthians* might make to the Arguments against their eating Meats offered to the Idols in the Idol Temple, taken from *Christians* eating Bread and Wine at the Lord's Table, and the *Jews* eating of the Sacrifices offered upon the Altar of the true God, St. Paul replies at the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Ver. *What say I then? that the Idol is any Thing, or that, which is offered in Sacrifice to Idols is any Thing?* No; I would not have you to understand me to say, that the Idol, or Meat offered to it, is any Thing as to Understanding or Will\*, is an intelligent Being, hath Understanding and a Will, is capable of giving Commands, and of having Disciples and Servants, of being their Head and Master, and of having them under an Obligation, and willing to obey its Will, nor by Consequence that, if there was nothing concerned about the Idol Temple and Sacrifices, but the Idol and Meat offered to it, you could by eating Meats offered to Idols profess and shew yourselves to be Disciples and Servants of any intelligent Being, which is capable of having Disciples and Servants, of being their Lord and Master, and of having them under an Obligation and willing to obey

\* See, p. 98.



its Will; nor that you could by your Example encourage others to be the Disciples and Servants of such a Being, by obeying whose Will they would be turned away, and hindered from obeying the Commands of *Christ*, from being his Disciples and Servants, and owning him for their Head and Master.

But the Want of Understanding and Will in the Idol is no Proof, that by eating Meats offered to it in the Idol Temple, you do not shew and profess yourselves to be Disciples and Servants of some Being, which has Understanding and a Will to be obeyed. For tho' the Idols have no Understanding nor Will; yet the Beings, in Honour to whom these Idols are set up, and to whom the Sacrifices are really and finally offered, have Understanding and Will, and these Beings are *Devils*, to whom the *Heathens* sacrifice the Things, which they sacrifice. *And I would not that you should have Fellowship with Devils*, should profess and openly shew yourselves to be Disciples and Servants of Devils, own them for your Head and Masters, and yourselves under an Obligation and willing to obey their Wills; as you see you plainly do by eating Meats offered to them in the Idol Temple, as well as *Christians* by eating and drinking Bread and Wine at the Lord's Table, and *Jews* by eating of the Sacrifices offered upon the Altar of the true God, do respectively profess and openly shew themselves to be the Disciples and Servants of *Christ* and God, own them for their Head and Master, and themselves under an Obligation, and willing to obey their Wills. I would not, I say, have you thus profess and shew yourselves to have Fellowship with Devils,

as it is a very shameful and scandalous Behaviour, a professing of yourselves to be Servants of, and obedient to the Will of those, who will nothing but what is sinful, filthy, and scandalous ; and a Behaviour, which, had you known the Tendency and Significancy of it, you would have been ashamed to have been guilty of ; and what you would also have avoided thro' the Horror and Dread of approaching to, or doing any Thing, which has any Relation to such malicious and hurtful Beings ; and which, now I have shewn you the Tendency and Significancy of it, I doubt not but you are wise and prudent enough to avoid both thro' Shame and Fear. And not only shameful and shocking is it for you thus to shew yourselves to *have Fellowship with Devils* ; but also hurtful to others, as you do by acting in that Manner, encourage Persons to continue in their Idolatrous Worship and Service, and to remain Servants of, and obedient to the Will of Devils, as all the *Heathens* are, and thereby hinder them from becoming the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*. So that not only for your own sakes ; but also for the sake of others, you should avoid professing yourselves to *have Fellowship with Devils* by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple. *You cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and be Partakers of the Lord's Table*, and thereby profess and shew yourselves to be the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*, and *drink the Cup of Devils*, and *be Partakers of the Table of Devils*, and thereby profess and shew yourselves to be the Disciples and Servants of Devils, without being guilty of a great Crime, and acting in a Manner contradictory and inconsistent with Truth. It must be a very great Crime in you, who are Disciples

ciples of *Christ*, and profess and openly shew yourselves to be so by eating and drinking Bread and Wine at his Table, to profess and openly shew yourselves to be Disciples of Devils, by eating at their Tables, whose Interest and Design is directly opposite to that of *Christ*, and whose Worship and Power he came to destroy ; which Worship and Power you encourage and advance, by professing and openly shewing yourselves to be their Disciples, by eating at their Tables. And this Behaviour of coming to the Lord's Table, and to the Table of Devils, is very contradictory and inconsistent with Truth. For thereby Persons profess themselves to be Servants and obedient to two Masters, whose Wills and Commands are directly opposite to each other, and both whom they cannot serve and obey ; and therefore they *cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table and of the Table of Devils* consistently with Truth ; without professing themselves to be, what in Truth and Reality they cannot be.

The Reason, why the Apostle would dissuade the *Corinthians* from eating Meats offered to Idols, was, besides its being an Act of Idolatry, and a shameful Behaviour in themselves, because it also tended to advance the Service of Devils, and prejudice the Service of *Christ* with respect to others, as appears from the latter Part of this Chapter ; and the Argument he makes use of for this Purpose, according to this Representation of it, stands thus. *Christians* by eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table, profess and shew themselves to be the Servants of *Christ* ; the *Jews* by eating of the Sacrifices offered upon the Altar, profess and shew themselves to be the Servants of God ; in like Manner you by eating  
Meats



Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple profess and shew yourselves to be Servants of Devils. But to this Argument the *Corinthians* would have objected, had not the Apostle stated and answered their Objection in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Verses. No surely, we cannot profess and shew ourselves Servants to Devils, by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, nor to any Thing else. For there is nothing, but the lifeless Idol, and the lifeless Meat offered to it, and they are not capable of having Servants, as they have no Understanding or Will; and surely we cannot profess and shew ourselves to be Servants of such Things, as are not capable of having Servants; nor can any be so foolish, as to think or understand, that we do so; or supposing they should, yet as there can be no Will at all to be obeyed, there can be none, by obeying which either we ourselves shall become less the Servants of *Christ*, or to obey which by our Example we cannot encourage others, so as to render them less the Servants of *Christ*; and therefore there can be no Harm in eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple.

In Answer to this Objection the Apostle says, I do not pretend to say, that the lifeless Idol or the lifeless Meat offered to it have Understanding or Will, so as to be capable of having Servants; but this I say, that you are very much mistaken to imagine, that there is nothing concerned about the Idol Temple, but the Idol and the Meat offered to it; for I can assure you, that *Devils* are concerned about those Temples, and to them are the Heathen Sacrifices offered, who have both Understanding and Will, are capable of having Servants, and to be their Servants, do you profess  
and

and shew yourselves by eating of the Things sacrificed to them.

And thus it appears, that, according to our Author's Interpretation of this Passage of *St. Paul*, those Words at the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Verses, are very pertinent to the Apostle's Argument, and there is a sufficient Reason for their being brought in; as they are necessary to state and answer an Objection, which the *Corinthians* would make to the Apostle's Argument; and that there is a sufficient Opposition expressed between the *Idol* in the 19<sup>th</sup> Ver. and the *Devils* in the 20<sup>th</sup>, which Opposition is, That *Idols* are lifeless inanimate Beings, but the *Devils* are intelligent Beings. And in this Sense must our Author be necessarily understood, when he represents the Apostle as saying, that he doth not mean to affirm, that the *Idols* are any *real Beings*. For it cannot be imagined, but that our Author knew, that a Stock or a Stone had a real Existence, or that he intended to represent the Apostle as affirming the contrary.

And having thus shewn, that, according to our Author's Interpretation of this Passage, the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Verses are very well accounted for, and appear to be very pertinent to the Apostle's Argument, I cannot help observing, that, according to the Interpretation of his Adversaries, the 17<sup>th</sup> Verse does not seem to be at all accounted for, nor to be any just Part of the Apostle's Argument. For if to eat Bread and drink Wine at the Lord's Table be *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* in the Sense of Persons having the Benefits of *Christ's* Death conveyed to them, at and by the very Act of eating and drinking; what Reason can there be for the Apostle to say  
in

108 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

in the next Verse, *For we being many are one Body and one Bread, for we are all Partakers of that one Bread?* This is neither a Reason, that Persons by eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table have the Benefits of *Christ's* Death conveyed to them, at and by the very Act of eating and drinking, nor a Consequence from it, nor does it at all connect the preceding and following Verses. But according to our Author's Interpretation the Connection of this Verse with the preceding is plain, and the Sense easy. By eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table, we profess and shew ourselves to be the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*, own him for our Head and Master, under whom we are one Body and Society. *For tho' we are many, yet are we all one Body and Society under Christ, which we shew ourselves to be by all partaking of one Loaf or Bread;* that is a Token or Sign of our being joined together in one Body and Society. And indeed, whenever the Adversaries of our Author interpret this Verse, they so interpret it, as to make the Sense of the foregoing Verse to be the same in which our Author interprets it; that by eating the Bread in the Lord's Supper Persons professed themselves to be the Disciples and Servants of the same Lord *Jesus Christ*; and if by eating the Bread they do this, they doubtless do the same likewise by drinking the Wine. As a Proof of this I shall set down the Interpretation of this Verse in the Words of Dr. *Warren*:  
 “ For we being many are united together in one  
 “ Society, and are made joint-partakers of the  
 “ same Bread, whereby we at once profess our-  
 “ selves to be Disciples of the same Lord,  
 “ and acknowledge our Dependance upon him,  
 “ as



“ as upon our Head, and hope for a Share in the “ Benefits and Effects of his Passion.” I suppose the Doctor adds those Words, “ hope for “ a Share in the Benefits and Effects of his “ Passion,” to persuade his Reader, that he has interpreted this Verse agreeably to his Interpretation of the preceding ; but there is a wide Difference between *hoping for a Share in the Benefits and Effects of Christ's Passion*, and actually receiving those Benefits ; nay, they are not consistent with each other ; for what a Man is actually in Possession of, why doth he, or how is it possible for him to hope for it ?

I shall now set down a Paraphrase upon this Passage of St. Paul, which, from what hath been said, appears, I think, to bid as fair for a true Interpretation of it, as any I have met with. But first I must observe, that since κοινωνία is so often translated *Fellowship*, and κοινωνός at the 20th Ver. is translated *having Fellowship*, there is no Reason, why κοινωνοι at the 18th Ver. should not be translated *having Fellowship*, and κοινωνία at the 16th Ver. be translated *Fellowship*, importing an Union together as Head and Members ; and also since this Sense is agreeable to the Use of the Words κοινωνία and κοινωνοι in profane Authors, as has been shewn. Moreover it is as easy and natural for *the Body and Blood of Christ* to signify *Christ himself*, as to signify the Benefits of *Christ's Passion* ; and for the *Altar*, § 18. to signify that God, to whom the Altar belonged, and who was the Institutor of it, as to signify the Benefits received by the Sacrifices offered upon the Altar. Translating therefore the Words κοινωνία and κοινωνός *Fellowship and having Fellowship*, as Head and Members, and understanding by *the Body and Blood*

110 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Blood of Christ, Christ himself, and by the Altar that God to whom the Altar belongs, it will be natural and obvious to understand those Words, The Cup of Blessing, which we bless, and the Bread, which we break, is it not the Fellowship of the Body and Blood of Christ? to signify, is it not that Rite, by which we profess our Fellowship, as Head and Members with Christ? and those Words, Are not they, which eat of the Sacrifices, Persons having Fellowship with the Altar? to signify, do they not by eating of the Sacrifices profess themselves to have Fellowship, as Head and Members, with that God, to whom the Altar belongs, upon which the Sacrifices are offered? and then the Sense of this Passage of St. Paul is very easy and natural, thus, The Cup of Blessing, which we bless, and the Bread, which we break, is it not the Fellowship of the Body and Blood of Christ? that is, that Rite, by which we profess our Fellowship, as Head and Members with Christ? For because there is one Loaf of Bread it shews we are one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread, which is a Sign of our being united in one Body. Behold Israel after the Flesh, are not they, which eat of the Sacrifices, Persons having Fellowship with the Altar? that is, Do they not by eating of the Sacrifices profess, that they have Fellowship, as Head and Members, with that God, to whom the Altar belongs, upon which the Sacrifices are offered? What say I then? that the Idol is any Thing, as to Understanding, so as to be capable of being Head of a Society, or to have Members under it? Or that, which is offered to Idols is any such Thing? but this I say, that you are very much mistaken to think, that the inanimate Idol, or the inanimate Meat offered to it, are the only Things*

Things concerned about the Idol Temple; for I can assure you, that *Devils* are concerned about them, and *that the Things, which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God;* and I would not that you should profess yourselves to have Fellowship with Devils, as Members of the Society of which they are the Head, as you do by eating Meats in the Idol Temple, which have been offered to Devils. *Ye cannot, consistently with Truth, drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils. Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, whereby you profess yourselves to have Fellowship with Christ, and of the Table of Devils, whereby you profess yourselves to have Fellowship with Devils. For whoever have Fellowship with Christ, walk in the Light, but they who have Fellowship with Devils walk in Darknefs.*

*The Sacrament of the Altar* says, p. 32, 33. That “ *κοινωνια* refers not to *us*, who eat and drink, but to that which is eaten and drunk by us in the Holy Eucharist. — But to explain this Text is not to tell us what we *do* in the Holy Communion, but to shew us in *what Sense* the Bread is the Communion of Christ's Body, and the Wine of his Blood.” Now if this be all, which is necessary to explain this Text, our Author has explained it. For he says, that the Bread and Wine are the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ in this Sense, that the eating and drinking them by Christians is a joint-partaking in common with others of that which is to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of Christ's Body and Blood. And in the Paraphrase here by me given, I have shewn the Bread and Wine to be the Communion of the Body and Blood of



of Christ in this Sense, that the *eating* and drinking them by *Christians* is a *Professing* themselves to have *Fellowship* with *Christ*, as Members of the Body of which he is the Head. Whether either, or which of these Explanations be true, the Intelligent Reader must judge for himself? but by them this Text is undeniably explained; and if this Author would say any Thing to his Purpose, he should prove, that the Bread and Wine are not *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* in either of these Senses, and that they are so in some other.

Thus have I shewn, that, according to our Author's Interpretation of this Passage of *St. Paul*, and without supposing that *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* signifies *the partaking of the Benefit of Christ's Death*, the 19<sup>th</sup> Verse, is very well accounted for, and appears to be very pertinent to the Apostle's Argument.

I shall next proceed to shew, that, upon the Supposition that *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* signifies the *Communicating* or *Partaking* of the Benefits of *Christ's Death*, and that those Benefits are communicated, or conveyed to us by eating Bread and drinking Wine in the Lord's Supper; yet it will not from thence follow, that Persons are made Partakers of the Benefits of *Christ's Death* by receiving the Lord's Supper, at and by the very Act of eating the Bread and drinking the Wine, or in any Manner different from that, in which our Author teaches they do receive them thereby.

For tho' we should allow *the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* to signify *to have communicated, or conveyed to us the Benefits of Christ's Death*;

*Death*; yet these Benefits may be *communicated* or *conveyed* to us by eating Bread and drinking Wine in the Lord's Supper, without their being *communicated* or *conveyed*, at and by the very Act of eating and drinking them. As if to eat and drink Bread and Wine there be a Means to do this, by having a natural Tendency to beget in us that Faith in *Christ*, those pious Resolutions, and that sincere Obedience, which are necessary Conditions of our being Partakers of the Benefits of the Gospel; or if it tends to confirm in us such Faith, Resolutions, and Obedience\*.

And to say, that to eat Bread and drink Wine in the Lord's Supper, is a Means to make Persons Partakers of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death in either of these Senses, agrees very well with the Design of the Apostle in this Place, and gives sufficient Force to his Argument for the Purpose for which he uses it. His Design here is, according to the present Supposition, to dissuade the *Corinthians* from eating Meats offered to the Idol in the Idol Temple, by shewing the mischievous Effects of it upon themselves. And this he is supposed to do, by telling them, that as *Christians*, by eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Table, were made Partakers of that, which it was the Design of the Christian Dispensation to confer on Mankind; and as the *Jews*, by eating of the Sacrifices offered upon the Altar, were made Partakers of that, which it was the Design of the Jewish Dispensation to confer on Mankind, so they, who eat of Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, were made Partakers of that, which it was the Design of those Beings

\* See under Prop. XVIII.

114 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

to do to Mankind, to whom those Meats were sacrificed.

And whereas God, and his Son *Jesus Christ*, who are the Authors of the *Jewish* and *Christian* Religions, were good and beneficent Beings, and and can design only the good of Mankind, therefore *Christians*, who eat and drink Bread and Wine at the Lord's Table, and *Jews*, who eat of the Sacrifices, are made Partakers of all the Benefits, which it is the Design of the *Christian* and *Jewish* Dispensations to confer on Mankind. But whereas the Beings, to whom Things were sacrificed by the *Heathens*, were *Devils* and evil Spirits, who intend the Hurt of Mankind, therefore they who eat of those Things in the Idol Temple, were made Partakers of all that Evil, which it was their Design, and which it was in their Power, to bring upon Men.

So that to say, that to eat Bread and drink Wine at the Lord's Supper, does in any Sense confer the Benefits of the Gospel on Men, gives sufficient Force to the Apostle's Argument to dissuade the *Corinthians* from eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple. For, in the Nature of the Thing, if to do the one be beneficial, to do the other is hurtful to them. As to eat Bread and drink Wine in the Lord's Supper tends to beget, or confirm in Men such Faith, such pious Resolutions, and so sincere an Obedience to the Commands of the Gospel, as that they have a present Title to, and will, if they continue in them, at last infallibly obtain eternal Life, thro' the Merits of *Christ Jesus*; so to eat Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple tends to beget and confirm in Men such Thoughts and Actions, as do at present put them in danger of,  
and



and will, if continued in, at last certainly bring them to everlasting Misery. And that the Lord's Supper has a Tendency towards making Men Partakers of the Benefits of the Gospel our Author allows.

Tho' Mr. *Bowyer* asserts in his first Proposition, that the Bread and Wine are Means of conveying all the Benefits of *Christ's* Passion; and in what he says afterwards endeavours to prove this; yet, as has been before observed, he professes to prove nothing contrary to the Sense of our Author there; and therefore I shall take no Notice of the Arguments brought by him under this Head; tho' the principal of them are considered in one Place or another of my Book.

And from what hath been said concerning this Passage of *St. Paul* it appears, that it is no Proof, that *Irenæus* believed the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper to be the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them, because he calls them the *Communication* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*<sup>a</sup>. For when he calls them the *Communication* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, he intends the same that *St. Paul* does, when in this Passage he calls them the *Communion* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*. But it does not appear, that *St. Paul* calls them the *Communion* of the Body and Blood of *Christ* in the Sense of their being Means to communicate, or convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them. Neither therefore does it appear, that *Irenæus* called, or believed the Bread and Wine to be the *Communi-*

<sup>a</sup> See p. 71.

116 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*tion* of the Body and Blood of *Christ* in that Sense.

And as it thus appears, that it cannot be proved either from the Fathers, or from Scripture, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of eating and drinking them ; so is it impossible for them to be the Body and Blood of *Christ* in this Sense according to the Terms of the Gospel. For, according to this Opinion, the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are not supposed to be conveyed to any by receiving the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, but to worthy Receivers ; and none are worthy Receivers, but they, who believe in *Christ*, and sincerely resolve and endeavour to obey the Gospel, or at least believe in *Christ*, and sincerely resolve to obey the Gospel, tho' they have not had Time to endeavour after it in the actual Amendment of their Lives. In the first Case, whoever believe in *Christ*, and sincerely resolve and endeavour to obey the Gospel, are at all Times actually in Possession of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as far as they can be in Possession of them in this World, and as far as these Benefits can be supposed by the Maintainers of this Opinion to be conveyed by receiving the Lord's Supper, that is, as they have a Share in the Merits of *Christ's* Death, have a Right and Title to all the Benefits which he came into the World to confer on Mankind. And then these worthy Receivers of the Lord's Supper have actually a Share in the Merits of *Christ's* Death, have a Right and Title to all the Benefits of it, before they eat and drink the Bread and Wine ;  
and

and therefore this Share, Right, and Title cannot be given and conveyed to them by the very Act of eating and drinking the Bread and Wine along with those material Elements. Since it is impossible for that to be given and conveyed to a Person by any Act, which he is actually in Possession of, and is not again deprived of it from the Time of that actual Possession to the Performance of that Act, which is supposed to convey it to him. This Share, Right, and Title may indeed be rendered more firm and secure to Persons; but that they should be given and conveyed to them, when they are already in Possession of them, is absolutely impossible and a Contradiction. Again in the second Case, if by only believing in *Christ* and sincerely resolving to obey the Gospel Persons have not performed the Conditions, upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, but there is still wanting an Endeavour after it in the Amendment of their Lives; as the Receiving the Lord's Supper is not actual Amendment of their Lives, Persons cannot receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving it. If Persons only by believing in *Christ*, and sincerely resolving to obey the Gospel without actual Amendment of Life, have performed the Conditions upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, they receive those Benefits immediately upon their thus believing and resolving before they receive the Lord's Supper. For where Persons have performed the Conditions, upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, their Receiving them is not deferred until they receive the Lord's Supper. Having therefore already received the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, when they receive



the Lord's Supper, they cannot receive them, at and by the very Act of Partaking of the Lord's Supper.

And as it thus appears, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are not the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they have any Power or Virtue annexed to them, so as that they convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Body broken and Blood-shed along with themselves; or as they are Means of conveying to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving them; so neither can it be supposed, that *Christ* called them his Body and Blood in this Sense. And here I shall produce an Argument or two, which seem plainly to prove, that *Christ* called the Bread and Wine, and intended them to be, his Body and Blood in the Sense of our Author, viz. As they are the Signs, Representations, or Memorials of his Body and Blood, to bring his Death and Passion to our Minds, and all the Benefits of it; at least they prove this much plainer, than the Opinion of his Adversaries can be proved.

The first Argument is taken from those Words of the Institution, *This do in Remembrance of me*. For that *do* does not here signify *to offer*, I shall hereafter prove<sup>a</sup>; and the most plain and natural Sense of REMEMBRANCE here, as has been observed<sup>b</sup>, is the *Remembrance* of Man; and that there is no Reason to understand it of the *Remembrance* of God, I shall hereafter prove<sup>c</sup>. Now when *Christ* had taken the Bread and Wine, and called them his Body and Blood, and given

<sup>a</sup> See under Prop. XVIII.

<sup>b</sup> Pag. 54, 55.

<sup>c</sup> See under Prop. X.

them to his Disciples to eat and drink, and afterwards said, THIS DO, thus eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of me, it seems natural, to understand him to call the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood; as they were to be the Signs, Representations, or Memorials of his Body and Blood; that as they were to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of him, so they were to be the Signs, Representations, or Memorials of his Body broken and Blood shed for us, to bring his Death and Passion to our Minds, and all the Benefits of it, in a more particular and serious Manner.

The second Argument is taken from the particular Time, at which *Christ* instituted the Lord's Supper. He instituted it, when he was eating the Passover with his Disciples. And since the *Paschal Lamb* is called the Lord's *Passover*; and yet was no otherwise so, as far as appears from Scripture, than as it was a Sign or Memorial of the Lord's *Passover*; to be killed and eaten in Remembrance that the Lord passed over the Houses of the Children of *Israel* in *Egypt*, when he smote the *Egyptians*, and delivered their Houses, and of their Deliverance from Captivity consequent to it; and since *Christ*, whilst he was eating of that Lamb in Remembrance of God's passing over the Houses of the *Israelites*, or immediately after, took Bread and Wine, and called them his Body and Blood, and commanded them to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of himself, is it not natural to think, that he called them his Body and Blood in the same Sense, in which the *Paschal Lamb* was the Lord's *Passover*? Is it not most natural, that the Apostles then, and with them all *Christians* afterwards, should understand

him in that Sense? That as the *Paschal Lamb* was a Sign, Representation, or Memorial of the Lord's passing over the Houses of the Children of *Israel* in *Egypt*, when he smote the *Egyptians*, and delivered their Houses, to be killed and eaten in Remembrance of it; so the Bread and Wine were to be the Signs, Representations, or Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, to be eaten and drunk in Remembrance of their being broken and shed for the sake of Mankind.

IX. Whoever therefore, in a serious and religious Sense of his Relation to *Christ*, as his Disciples perform these Actions of *eating Bread* and *drinking Wine*, in Remembrance of *Christ*, as of a Person *corporally absent* from his Disciples, most certainly performs them agreeably to the End of the *Institution* declared by *Christ* himself, and his immediate Disciples.

To this Proposition nothing is particularly objected, or nothing, but what is answered by what is said under the preceding.

X. There being *other* Passages of the *New Testament*, besides those already cited, which *occasionally* relate to this Subject: It is of Importance to all *Christians* to consider them; and to examine what farther Instructions they contain about this Holy Rite.

The first of those Texts, meant by our Author in this Proposition, is *1 Cor. x.*

This Text has been considered under the eighth Proposition; as it was brought to confute what he has taught in that Proposition, tho' it be mentioned by our Author under this.

Under this Proposition our Author asserts, and brings Arguments to prove, that the Lord's Sup-  
per



per is not a material Sacrifice, or that the Bread and Wine are not therein offered in Sacrifice to God. The contrary to which some of his Adversaries assert, and endeavour to prove.

Mr. Bowyer asserts this in his second Proposition, and begins to prove it from that Text of Scripture, *Malach. i. 10. From the rising of the Sun even unto the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every Place shall be offered unto my Name Incense and a pure Offering.* But if this Prophecy relates to the Lord's Supper, which is much to be doubted, and the Word MINCHA, here translated a *pure Offering*, does in the Hebrew signify a *Meal Offering*, or an *Oblation of Bread*, it does not thence follow, that Bread is to be offered in Sacrifice to God in this Sacrament; because there is no Reason, that *Mincha* in this Text, signifying a *Meal Offering*, is to be understood literally, but the contrary. For it is allowed, that Incense here is not to be understood literally to signify material *Incense*; but figuratively, to signify *Prayers*; and no Reason can be given, why *Mincha* also should not be understood in the same Sense, to signify not a *material Offering*; but a *spiritual* one; and that it signifies either the same Offering, which *Incense* does, viz. *Prayers*, or the Offering of Praise and Thanksgiving, or of ourselves to the Service of God<sup>a</sup>.

Dr. Brett endeavours to prove, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are offered as a material Sacrifice to God from Mr. Johnson. And for this Purpose he cites a Passage out of the first Part of his *Unbloody Sacrifice*, p. 92. where Mr. Johnson says; "That St. Paul, 1 Cor. x.

<sup>a</sup> See Mr. Wingfeild's *Lord's Supper not a Sacrifice*, p. 14.

“ 16, 21. having cautioned the People against  
 “ Idolatry, that is, eating Meats offered to Idols  
 “ in the Heathen Temple, proceeds to prove,  
 “ that by eating such Meats they honoured and  
 “ communicated with those false Gods, to whom  
 “ they were offered; and to make this good, he  
 “ runs a Parallel between Things offered to the  
 “ true God, and Things offered to Idols.” *The*  
*Sacrament of the Altar* argues in the same  
 manner as Mr. *Johnson* from this Passage to prove  
 the Lord’s Supper to be a material Sacrifice, p. 28  
 and 46.

The Things, between which Mr. *Johnson* sup-  
 poses St. *Paul* to run the Parallel, are the Bread  
 and Wine eat and drunk by *Christians* at the  
 Lord’s Table, and Meats offered to Idols; and  
 he likewise supposes, that this Bread and Wine  
 had been offered to God, as well as those Meats  
 had been offered to Idols. And was this true;  
 was the Apostle’s Parallel really between the Bread  
 and Wine in the Lord’s Supper, and the Meats  
 in the Heathen Temple, considered in this parti-  
 cular Relation of the one’s being offered to the  
 true God, and the other’s being offered to Idols,  
 it would follow, that the Bread and Wine were  
 offered to God in the Lord’s Supper. But how is  
 this proved? why Mr. *Johnson* proves it by say-  
 ing, “ That in the 16<sup>th</sup> Ver. St. *Paul* must take  
 “ it for granted, that this Eucharistical Cup and  
 “ Bread had been offered to God, for otherwise  
 “ the Parallel is lost.” But why is the Parallel  
 lost? it is not lost, except there can be no Parallel  
 between eating Bread and Wine in the Lord’s  
 Supper, and eating Meats offered to Idols in the  
 Heathen Temple, without supposing, that the  
 Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper are offered

to God. But there is a very manifest Parallel between them without this Supposition. And the Parallel is this, that by eating Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, Persons openly shewed and professed themselves to be Servants and Disciples of *Christ*, and by eating Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple, Person openly shewed and professed themselves to be Servants and Disciples of Devils. And if to eat Bread and drink Wine in the Lord's Supper, was an Action performed in consequence of *Christ's* instituting that Rite, and in obedience to his Command to observe it, as it really was; and to eat Meats offered to Idols in the Idol Temple was an Action performed in Honour to Devils, as it really was, this Parallel does well hold, without supposing that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper were offered to the true God, as the Meats in the Heathen Feasts were to Devils. The Parallel is not here between the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, and the Meats in the Heathen Feasts, considered the one as offered to the true God, and the other as offered to Devils; but it is between the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, and the Meats in the Heathen Feasts, considered the one as eaten and drunk in Obedience to the Command of *Christ*, and the other as eaten in Honour to Devils; or rather the Parallel is not between the Things, the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, and the Meats in the Heathen Feasts; but between the Actions of eating and drinking the one, and eating the other. And what Mr. *Johnson* says in the next Words to prove, that the Parallel is lost between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> v. except the Apostle takes it for granted, or supposes, that the Cup and Bread in the Lord's Supper are offered



offered to God, is grounded upon the Mistake, that the Parallel is between the Things, and not between the Actions. For, says he, "The Apostle's Argument proceeds thus; viz. The Bread and Cup in the Sacrament, is the eating and drinking of a Sacrifice, as the Banquets in the Heathen Temples are." The Sense of which more explicitly expressed is this, to eat the Bread and drink the Wine in this Sacrament, is the eating and drinking of Things offered to God, as the Banquets in the Heathen Temples are feasting upon Things offered to Devils. Whereas the Apostle's Argument does not proceed in that manner; but in a very different one, thus, To eat the Bread and drink the Cup in the Lord's Supper, is a Token of Persons being the Disciples and Servants of *Christ*, and so to feast upon the Banquets in the Heathen Temples is a Token of Persons being the Disciples and Servants of Devils. To say, that the Apostle's Argument proceeds in the manner Mr. *Johnson* says it does, is plainly begging the Question. The Proposition to be proved is, that St. *Paul* in this Passage represents the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, as Things *offered* or *sacrificed* to God; or, which is the same, that the Apostle's Argument here taken from the Lord's Supper against the *Corinthians* eating Meats offered to Idols, proceeds or is founded upon this Supposition, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are *offered* or *sacrificed* to God; and then to go about to prove this by saying or supposing, that the Apostle's Argument here does proceed, or is founded upon this Supposition, that to eat the Bread and drink the Cup in this Sacrament, is to eat

eat and drink Things offered to God, is plainly to say, or suppose the Point in Question.

Mr. *Johnson* next says, " That it farther appears, that St. *Paul* supposes, what was eaten and drunk at the Lord's Supper had been first offered, from the Instance of the *Israelites* in the 18<sup>th</sup> y." But how does it appear from this? it does not follow, that St. *Paul* supposes the Bread and Wine to have been offered to God, because the Sacrifices of which the *Israelites* eat had been offered, for the Reason before mentioned; that the Parallel intended to be made here by St. *Paul*, is not between the Things, but between the Actions of eating them.

And this Reason shews the Falshood of what Mr. *Bowyer* asserts, p. 47. when arguing from this Text to prove, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are offered to God as a material Sacrifice; vzi. That the Apostle intimates in this Chapter, " That *Heathens* had Fellowship with *Devils* by sacrificing to them: And that *Christians* had Fellowship with the Lord by sacrificing also." Whereas he can only intimate, that as *Heathens* had Fellowship with *Devils* by sacrificing to them; so *Christians* had Fellowship with *Christ* by partaking of the Lord's Supper. This is all that the Apostle's Argument, and the Parallel here made by him between the Heathen Feasts and the Lord's Supper requires.

And for the same Reason it is, that Mr. *Johnson* to the former Part of the 20<sup>th</sup> y. I say, that the Things, which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, adds without any Reason these Words, as the *Christians* do in their Eucharist, that is, sacrifice the Things to God.

And

And this, he says, the Apostle speaks more fully in the 21st v. *Ye cannot consistently drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot consistently be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.* And the Reason he gives, why the Apostle does more clearly speak the same, *i. e. that the Bread and Wine are offered in sacrifice to God,* in this Verse, is, because he supposes, that the Cup of the Lord here mentioned had been offered in Honour to him, as the Cup of Devils had been offered in Honour to them. This is also supposed by Mr. Bowyer p. 47. But, for the Reason above given, this Supposition is groundless; and it is also supposing the Thing to be proved. Mr. Johnson farther supposes, as Mr. Bowyer also does, p. 47. that the Table of the Lord denotes an Altar erected for his Worship, as the Table of Devils denotes an Altar raised for the Worship of Devils. By which if he means, that the Table of the Lord denotes an Altar erected for his Worship by offering material Sacrifices upon it, because the Table of Devils denotes an Altar raised for the Worship of Devils by offering material Sacrifices upon it, I answer that the Reason is not good. First, For the Reason above given, because the Parallel here run by the Apostle between eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Lord's Supper, and eating at the Heathen Feasts upon their Sacrifices, does not require the Supposition of the Lord's Table being such an Altar. Secondly, It does not appear, that the *Table of Devils* here signifies an Altar raised for the Worship of Devils by offering material Sacrifices upon it. For tho' Mr. Johnson says indeed, that the Table of Devils cannot be justly understood of feasting Tables distinct



distinct from the Altar; yet I affirm, that the Table of Devils may very justly be understood of such feasting Tables, and most probably ought to be so understood; and that this Table of Devils, at which the *Corinthians* eat the Meats offered to Idols, was not the Altar, upon which those Meats had been offered in Sacrifice to Devils; but a Table distinct from the Altar in another Part of the Temple, if not in their own Houses, upon which the Things, which had been sacrificed to Devils, were placed, and at which their Feasts in Honour to their Idols were celebrated. For the Apostle does not in the least intimate, that the *Corinthians* were present at the Heathen Altar, when those Meats were sacrificed to Devils, nor reprove them for being so; which he certainly would have done, had they been then present at the Altar; this being as it were to assist at the Offering of those Meats, and a greater Crime, and more manifest Act of Idolatry, than only to eat of them, after they had been sacrificed. And if the *Corinthians* were not present at the Altar, when these Meats were sacrificed, they could not join with the *Heathens* in eating them immediately after they were sacrificed; and if the Meats were not eaten immediately after they were sacrificed, it is most probable, that they were taken off from the Altar, and not brought again to it to be eaten there, but that they were eaten in some other Place, and upon some other Table.

But Mr. *Johnson* gives a Reason, why the Table of Devils cannot be understood of any Table distinct from the Altar, which is, *because to be Partakers of the Table*, in this Verse, is parallel to that of being *Partakers of the Altar*, & 18. Mr. *Bowyer* also says, that the *Table of Devils* is parallel

128 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

allel to the *Jewish Altar*, p. 48. and that to be Partakers of the *Table of Devils*, is parallel to the being Partakers of the *Jewish Altar*, p. 53. But to be Partakers of the *Table of Devils*,  $\psi$  21. is not parallel to being Partakers of the *Altar*,  $\psi$  18. but it is parallel to *eating of the Sacrifices*,  $\psi$  18. as will appear to any one, who duly considers this Passage. The *Jews*, by *eating of the Sacrifices*, were Partakers of the *Altar*, κοιῳνοὶ τῷ θυσιᾷ, Persons having Fellowship, or professing their Fellowship, as Head and Members with the Altar, that is, that God, to whom the Altar belonged. Persons by partaking of the *Table of Devils*, (where to partake of the Table of Devils is expressed by the Word μετέχειν, and not by the Word κοιῳνεῖν, which Word μετέχειν does not import the same, as the Word κοιῳνοὶ, by which being Partakers of the Altar is expressed; μετέχειν signifies to partake of some Thing, κοιῳνοὶ having Fellowship with some Person, which is here said to be shewn by partaking of something; and therefore to be Partakers of the *Table of Devils*, and being Partakers of the *Altar*,  $\psi$  18. cannot be parallel to each other;) Persons by partaking of the *Table of Devils*, I say, were Persons having Fellowship with Devils, κοιῳνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων, professing their Fellowship, as Head and Members with Devils. And thus it plainly appears, that to be Partakers of the *Table of Devils* is not parallel to being Partakers of the *Altar*,  $\psi$  18. but to *eating of the Sacrifices*. And hence it follows, that the *Table of Devils* is not parallel to the *Jewish Altar*; but to that, from off which the People of the *Jews* eat that Part of the Peace-offering, which they were permitted to eat, which was not the Altar, upon which the Peace-offering had been offered. For this Part  
of

of the Peace-offering was not eat in the Place, where the Altar stood; but in another Place at a Distance from the Altar. It was eat in the *Court of the Tabernacle of the Congregation*. But the Altar, upon which the Peace-offerings were offered, did not stand in the *Court* of the Tabernacle; but before the Door of the Tabernacle within it; whereas the *Court* was by the Side round about the Tabernacle<sup>a</sup>. And hence it appears, that the *Table of Devils* does not denote an Altar raised for the Worship of Devils by offering material Sacrifices upon it; but feasting Tables distinct from the Altar. Mr. *Johnson's* Premises in this Passage, as also what Mr. *Bowyer* has asserted in Agreement with him, appearing to be false, the Conclusion drawn from them must be so too, if there be no other Proof of it, viz. That the *Table of the Lord* is a Phrase signifying his *Altar*.

Before I leave this Particular I shall observe, that there is a very sufficient Parallel between the Cases of the Lord's Supper, the Jewish Sacrifices, and the eating Meats offered to Idols, mentioned in this Passage of St. *Paul*, without supposing, that the Bread and Wine were offered to God, according to the other Sense, of Benefits being conveyed by the Lord's Supper, as it is a Means to convey to Persons the Benefits of *Christ's* Death in the Sense of our Author. And according to this Sense the Parallel runs thus. To eat Bread and drink Wine in the Lord's Supper is a Means to convey to *Christians* the Benefits of *Christ's* Death; to eat of the Jewish Sacrifices was a Means to convey to the *Jews* the Benefits of the Jewish Religion; to eat of Meats offered

<sup>a</sup> Lev. vi. 16, and x. 12. and Exod. xl.



to Idols, is a Means to convey to, or bring upon Persons the Evils, which the Devils do to Mankind.

Dr. *Brett* next proceeds to our Author's Argument against the Bread and Wine's being offered to God taken from hence; "That had St. *Paul* had that Notion of them, he must in this Passage have said something of an Altar's being used in the Lord's Supper, and not have spoken only of a Table." And whereas it is objected to this, that the Altar in the Jewish Temple, which is undoubtedly an Altar, is yet sometimes called a Table, and that therefore what St. *Paul* calls only a Table here, might, notwithstanding that, be an Altar: To this our Author replies, that there is no Reason to imagine, that what was never once declared to serve any one Purpose of an Altar, nor once called by that Name, may yet be an Altar, notwithstanding it is called only a Table; because what is acknowledged, and declared to be an Altar in its principal Uses, but serving in some respects the Uses of a Table, is also sometimes called a Table. But this, Dr. *Brett* says, is not a sufficient Answer to the Objection. Because the Table, used for the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, is not called simply a Table, but *the Lord's Table*, and the Words *Lord's Table* in all other Places of Scripture, where they are used, signify an Altar, and therefore it must be strange Prejudice to take them in another Sense in this Passage of St. *Paul*. This is also intimated by Mr. *Bowyer*, p. 49. But I think it is no Prejudice at all to take the Phrase *Lord's Table* in another Sense in this Passage of St. *Paul*. Because that, which is manifestly signified by the *Lord's Table* in those other Places of Scripture,

Scripture, where this Phrase is used, is acknowledged and declared to be an Altar, appointed to serve the Purposes of one, and generally called by that Name; but that, which is signified by the *Lord's Table* in this Passage of *St. Paul*, is never acknowledged, nor declared to be an Altar, nor appointed to serve the Purposes of an Altar, nor once called by that Name, but called only the *Lord's Table*. And upon this Account the Reason given above by our Author in Answer to the first Objection holds good for taking the Phrase, *Lord's Table*, in this Passage of *St. Paul* in a Sense different from that, in which it is used in other Places of Scripture. That there is no Reason to understand, whatever is in Scripture called the *Lord's Table* to be an Altar, tho' it be never called by that Name, nor once declared to serve the Purposes of an Altar, because that, which is generally called an Altar, and plainly declared and acknowledged to be an Altar, and to serve the Purposes of one, is sometimes called the *Lord's Table*.

But *Dr. Brett* says, as does also *The Sacrament of the Altar*, that the Table at the Lord's Supper is expressly called an Altar by *St. Paul*, *Heb. xiii. 10*. *Mr. Bowyer* also brings this Text to prove, that the Lord's Supper is a Sacrifice, and says, that *Dr. Whitby* interprets it of the Lord's Supper. *We have an Altar, whereof they have no Right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle*. This Passage our Author denies to be spoken of the Lord's Supper; and says, that there is no Interpreter, ancient or modern, of great note, who interprets this obscure Passage of the Lord's Supper. To which *Dr. Brett* replies by mentioning several learned Men, who have interpreted this

Passage of the Lord's Supper. Now whether our Author by *Interpreter* meant one, who had wrote a Comment or Paraphrase upon the Scripture, or whether he did not think the Persons mentioned by Dr. *Brett* to be Interpreters of great note, I shall not pretend to determine; but proceed to observe, that these Persons, tho' they were learned, might err in their Interpretations of Scripture; and therefore barely to shew, that these Writers did understand this Passage of the Lord's Supper without producing any Reason given by them why they so understood it, and no Reason is produced, is not a sufficient Proof, that this Passage was intended of the Lord's Table, when there appears no Reason so to understand it. The Scope and Design of St. *Paul*, in this Chapter, does not at all require, nor favour such an Interpretation; and then there can be no Reason for it, but the Supposition, that the Lord's Table was an Altar; which being the Proposition to be proved, it cannot be urged to support such an Interpretation of this Text, as is brought to prove it. And perhaps this Supposition was the only Reason, which those learned Gentlemen had to interpret this Passage of the Lord's Table.

If Dr. *Whitby* does in Effect interpret this Passage of the Lord's Table, as Mr. *Bowyer* says, p. 58. yet it is to so little Effect, as not to prove, that the Altar here signifies the Lord's Table, but plainly to prove the contrary. For in his Annotations he says the *Altar* signifies, not the *Lord's Table*, but the Sacrifice offered upon the *Altar*, and that this is the Body of our Lord offered and broken on the *Cross*. In which last Words is intimated also, that the *Altar*, upon which



which the Sacrifice was offered, which is here signified by the *Altar*, is the *Cross*. And in the following Words, *Partaking of the Memorials of which Body*, which signify the *Sacramental Bread*, Dr. *Whitby* cannot mean, that they partook of the *Sacramental Bread* from off the *Altar* here mentioned, or that the *Altar* here mentioned signified the *Table*, upon which the *Sacramental Bread* was placed; for he plainly says, that the *Altar* is not that *Table*; but signifies the Sacrifice of the Body of *Christ* offered upon the *Altar* of the *Cross*. And whereas Mr. *Bowyer* says, "Does not the Argument he here offers to prove, that the *Altar* properly signifies the Sacrifice offered upon the *Altar*, viz. that of this Sacrifice they were to eat, plainly prove, that by the Sacrifice of the *Altar*, which we eat, is meant the *Sacramental Bread*?" I answer no; except it proves Dr. *Whitby* to contradict himself. For he expressly says, that the Sacrifice offered upon the *Altar*, which we eat, imports the Body of *Christ* offered upon the *Altar* of the *Cross*, and not the *Sacramental Bread*. Mr. *Bowyer* farther says, "Does he not allow that the *Partaking of the Memorials of Christ's Body* is the Means, &c. should not this therefore be the primary Meaning of *Partaking of the Altar*?" I answer, That, if Dr. *Whitby* does intend, that the *Partaking of the Memorials of Christ's Body* is the primary Meaning of *Partaking of the Altar*, he can only intend, that *Partaking of the Altar* means the *Partaking of the Memorials of that Sacrifice of Christ's Body, which had been offered upon an Altar*: but he cannot intend, that the *Partaking of the Altar* signifies the *Partaking of the Memorials of Christ's Body* from off the *Altar*

134 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

here mentioned; or that the *Altar* here mentioned signifies the *Table*, upon which the Memorials of *Christ's* Body are placed in the Lord's Supper. For he expressly and plainly says, That the *Altar* is not that *Table*; but signifies the Sacrifice of the Body of *Christ* offered upon the *Altar* of the *Cross*.

Our Author shews, that the Scope and Design of St. *Paul* in this Epistle, is against interpreting this Text of the Lord's Supper<sup>a</sup>; to disprove which nothing is said. Our Author then goes on, and observes, that throughout this whole Epistle the Apostle represents *Christ* to be the *High-Priest*, the *Offerer*, and *Sacrificer* of himself, which is undeniable; and then, upon the Supposition, that *Christ* offered himself upon the *Cross*, he concludes, that the *Cross* is the only Christian Altar, and of that is this Text of St. *Paul* to be understood.

Against this Dr. *Brett* says, That *Christ* did not offer himself upon the *Cross*, and that there is no other Time, when he could offer himself; but when he instituted the Holy Eucharist. The first Reason the Doctor gives, why *Christ* did not offer himself upon the *Cross*, is, that upon the *Cross* he bore our Sins; but St. *Paul* says, he was offered to bear; now if he was offered to bear, the Offering must precede the Bearing. For we cannot say he was offered to bear at the very Time he was actually bearing; therefore *Christ* must have offered himself before he was upon the *Cross* to bear. Mr. *Bowyer* also asserts, that *Christ* did not offer himself upon the *Cross*; but when he instituted the Lord's Supper, and brings the same Reason to prove it.

<sup>a</sup> See p. 85. of the *Plain Account*.

But

But this Reason is only playing with Words. It is a very common Way of speaking to say, that one Thing is done to do another, when they are both done at the same Time. Thus, my Pen is upon this Paper to write, and is upon the Paper at the very Time it is actually writing upon it. A Person pays an hundred Pounds to ransom a Captive; and yet the Person pays the hundred Pounds, and ransoms the Captive at the same Time he pays the hundred Pounds; and so pays the hundred Pounds to ransom the Captive at the very Time he is actually ransoming him. *Christ* was put to Death to atone for our Sins; and yet he was put to Death, and atoned for our Sins at the same Time. For it was by his Death that the Atonement was made. And then he was put to Death to atone for our Sins at the very Time he was actually atoning for them. And so notwithstanding it is said, that *Christ* was offered to bear our Sins, it may be said, that he was offered to bear at the very Time he was actually bearing them.

Dr. *Brett* next brings an Argument out of Mr. *Johnson* to prove, that *Christ* offered himself, when he instituted the Eucharist. This Argument is founded upon *Christ*'s saying in the Words of the Institution in the present Tense, *this is my Body given, or offered, for you, and this is my Blood shed for you.* From whence Mr. *Johnson* argues thus, " That since *Christ* says so expressly, " that his Body was given, and his Blood shed, " when he administered the Bread and Wine to " the Apostles, we must understand him, not as " using the Time present for the Time future; " but to mean the present Time, and that he did " then actually offer up his *natural* Body and " Blood



136 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ Blood to God, as a Ransom for the Sins of  
 “ Men.” For it must be the *natural* Body and  
 Blood of *Christ*, which is meant in this Argument  
 of Mr. *Johnson*, when it is said *his Body and  
 Blood were offered, as a Ransom for the Sins of  
 Men.* For it is the *natural* Body and Blood of  
*Christ*, which is the Ransom or Atonement for  
 the Sins of Men, and not the Bread and Wine in  
 the Eucharist; and therefore by the offering of  
 the *natural* Body and Blood of *Christ* are Men's  
 Sins ransomed or atoned for, and not by the Of-  
 fering of the Bread and Wine. And then it is a  
 sufficient Confutation of this Argument to say,  
 that, by this Way of arguing, we may as well con-  
 clude, that the *natural* Body of *Christ* was actu-  
 ally broken, and his natural Blood actually shed,  
 when he instituted the Lord's Supper. For *Christ*  
 does expressly declare this to be done; and yet it  
 is certain, that his *natural* Body was not broken,  
 nor his natural Blood shed, when he instituted the  
 Eucharist. And therefore *Christ* must necessarily  
 be understood to use the present Time for the fu-  
 ture, and to mean, when he calls the Bread and  
 Wine his Body and Blood *given* and *shed* for you,  
 that they are his Body and Blood, or the Signs  
 and Memorials of his Body and Blood, which  
 Body and Blood shall be given and shed for  
 them.

Mr. *Bowyer* brings an Argument from *Christ's*  
 speaking thus in the present Tense in the Words  
 of the Institution to prove, that he then offered  
 the Bread and Wine to God, and under the Sym-  
 bols of Bread and Wine his own Body and Blood,  
 p. 39, 40. But as it appears from what is above  
 said, that *Christ* used the present Time for the  
 future, this Argument is without Foundation.  
 Mr,

Mr. Bowyer says, "That which was then given, was given not unto *Man*, but unto *God*." It is true, that, which was said to be given, was afterwards to be given not unto *Man*, but unto *God*; but it was not then actually given. Again, "That which was thus given unto *God*, was Bread, for thus the Induction runs. — That which our Saviour saith was then given, he calls his *Body*." But I deny, that our Saviour calls that his *Body*, which in the Words of the Institution he says was given. That which he calls his *Body*, is the *Bread*; but it is not the *Bread*, which is given for Men for the Remission of their Sins, but the natural *Body* of *Christ*.

Again he says, p. 41. "That it is the Bread which our Saviour here speaks of, is farther evident, in that it could not be applied so well to his natural *Body*, it being prophesied of this, that a *Bone* of it should not be broken; and accordingly it is expressly told us, that they broke not his *Legs*." But tho' a *Bone* of our Saviour, or his *Legs* were not broken; yet his *Body* was broken. His *Body* was broken, when the Soldier pierced it with his *Spear*; and the Phrase of his *Body* being broken, is sufficiently answered by its being deprived of Life. He goes on; "And in *St. Luke* still more plainly of the Cup it is said (not of the Blood) it is shed for you." But it is so plainly affirmed in the New Testament, that only the natural *Blood* of *Christ* was shed for Men; and it is so evident in the Nature of the Thing, that Men's Sins can be forgiven only for the Sake of his natural *Blood's* being shed, and that that only was shed for the Sins of Men, for the Sake of which they were forgiven, that it is most unreasonable to understand

stand our Saviour, when he says, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you*, to mean, that the Wine in the Cup is shed for you.

Mr. Bowyer farther says in a Note in the Margin, "It is observable here, that the Article *το* is Prepositive, whereas if it had agreed with *αἷματι*, it should have been Subjunctive *ἐν*." To which I reply, that, besides that these Articles are used indiscriminately for each other, the Article is as much required to be Subjunctive to agree with *πότηριον*, as to agree with *αἷματι*. Moreover the Prepositive Article *το* joined with a Participle, as here, signifies the same, as the Subjunctive Article *ἐν* with a Verb; so that *ἐνχρυσόμενον* signifies the same as *ἐνχρυσεται*.

In the Words of the Institution, when the Body and Blood of *Christ* are predicated of *this*, that is, the Bread and Wine, they do not signify the real and natural Body and Blood of *Christ*, but the Signs and Representations of them: but when *given* or *broken* for you, or *shed* for you, and *for many* for the Remission of Sins, is predicated of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, the Body and Blood of *Christ* signifies his real and natural Body and Blood. This is agreeable to the constant and common Way of speaking, when Signs and Representations are spoken of. Thus suppose, speaking of a *Picture* of our Saviour, we should say, this *Picture* is our Saviour *Christ*, who died to redeem Mankind. Here, as our Saviour *Christ* is predicated of the *Picture*, our Saviour *Christ* does not signify our real Saviour *Christ*, but the Representation of him: but as *died* to redeem Mankind, is predicated of our Saviour *Christ*,  
our



our Saviour Christ signifies our real Saviour Christ.

And this furnishes us with an Answer to what the Sacrament of the Altar says, p. 12. to prove, that at the Institution of the Lord's Supper Christ offered to God the Bread and Wine. "He speaks in the present Tense, *δίδωμι, ἐκχυνόμενον*, what he gave to his Disciples, that he first gave for them: for of that, which he gave to them, he said, *This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you.*" But Christ did not say of that, which he gave to them, *this is my Body given for you, this is my Blood poured out for you*; for he did not say of it, that it was given for you, or poured out for you; because those Words given for you, and poured out for you, relate only to the natural Body and Blood of Christ. And what the same Author urges from Christ's speaking in the present Tense to prove, that, at the Institution of the Eucharist, Christ offered his natural Body and Blood to God, is sufficiently answered from what hath been already said.

And it may as well be concluded, that the Lord had actually passed over the Houses of the Children of Israel at the Time Moses instituted the Passover in Egypt, because he says of the Paschal Lamb in the present Tense *it is the Lord's Passover*; as that the Body and Blood of Christ were actually given and shed, when he instituted the Eucharist, because he says of the Bread and Wine in the present Tense, *this is my Body given, this is my Blood shed.*

This Author says, p. 14. "If the Bread and Wine were Figures and Representations of

\* See Page 136.

140 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“*Christ’s Body given, and his Blood shed, there*  
 “*must be something wherein they do agree, that*  
 “*there may be a Foundation for calling them,*  
 “*his Body and Blood given for them: But now*  
 “*wherein do they agree? How are the Bread*  
 “*and Wine like unto Christ’s Body and Blood,*  
 “*except in that they are both Sacrifices or Ob-*  
 “*lations to God?*” To which I answer, That  
 there is a sufficient Likeness or Agreement be-  
 tween the Bread and Wine, and the Body and  
 Blood of *Christ* without their being both Sacrifices  
 or Oblations to God, in that the Bread and the  
 Wine are two different Sorts of Substances like  
 the Body and Blood of *Christ*; the Bread a Sub-  
 stance, whose Parts adhere fast to each other, as  
 the Parts of the Body, that is, the *Flesh* and  
*Bones* of *Christ* do, and the Wine a fluid Sub-  
 stance, as the Blood of *Christ* is. And there is  
 no Necessity for the Bread and Wine, and the  
 Body and Blood of *Christ* to agree, or be like  
 each other any farther, in order for the one to be  
 the Figures and Representations of the other:  
 but *Christ* might, if he pleased, appoint the one  
 to be the Figures and Representations of the  
 other without any farther Likeness or Agreement.

P. 15. This Author says, “ I suppose he will  
 “ not deny, that *Christ* commanded, (and I add  
 “ *commissioned*) his Apostles to do as he had  
 “ done.” In which Words, if by *commissioned* he  
 means *commissioning* the Apostles as Priests, (and  
 if he does not mean this by it, I can see no Rea-  
 son why it is added) I must add, that he is mis-  
 taken; unless *Christ* then *commissioned* all *Christi-*  
*ans* as Priests. For the Words, *this do*, which  
 contain this Commission, are spoken to, and equal-  
 ly concern all *Christians*; and therefore are no Com-  
 mission

mission to the Apostles of what they were to do as Priests; but a Command to them and all *Christians* of what they were to do as *Christians*.

At the Bottom of this Page, this Author brings an Argument from the Reason and Nature of the Thing itself to prove, that the Bread and Wine are offered to God to bring the grand Sacrifice of *Christ's* Body and Blood in Remembrance before God. "All Sorts of People, says he, who call themselves *Christians*, except the Quakers, do hold the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a *religious Duty*; and if it be a religious Duty, it must be performed *to* and *before* God, as all other religious Duties are; and consequently the Commemoration or Representation of our Lord's Death and Passion, made in this Ordinance, must be made *to* and *before* God, otherwise it has not the Nature of a religious Duty." To which I answer, that the Lord's Supper may be performed *to* and *before* God, as all other religious Duties are; and yet the Commemoration or Representation of our Lord's Death and Passion, made in this Ordinance, not be made *to* and *before* God by offering the Bread and Wine as a Sacrifice to him to bring the Sacrifice of *Christ's* Body and Blood in Remembrance before him. For the Lord's Supper may be performed *to* and *before* God, as it is performed in Obedience to his Command, and in his Presence, before whom we always are. And who sees not, that this may be done at the Lord's Supper only by the Bread and Wine's being consecrated, as they are set apart from a common to an holy Use, and by their being given to, and eaten and drunk by *Christians* to bring into their Minds, and preserve there the Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of *Christ*, without



without the Bread and Wine being offered to God to bring the Sacrifice of *Christ* in Remembrance before him? This is all the *to* and *before* God, which is absolutely necessary to a *religious Duty*, and which is implied in the Nature of it as such; and if this Author means any Thing else by *to* and *before* God, it will either beg the Question, or not at all more serve his Purpose.

This Author goes on, p. 16. "The Practice of Antiquity makes it plain, that the primitive Church, in the first and purest Ages, did understand this Rite, as designed to render God propitious to us by representing to him the Merits of our Saviour's Sufferings. The Fathers frequently speak of making a Memorial before God of the grand Sacrifice." But if the Fathers frequently speak of making a Memorial before God of the grand Sacrifice, it is a wonder this Author did not produce some Passages from them, in which they speak of this amongst those Quotations out of them, which he has given us in his *Appendix*. His not doing it gives Reason to suspect, that they do not so frequently speak of it, as he affirms. In the Passages produced by him they do indeed speak of offering the Bread and Wine to God, and in one of them of offering them for a Memorial; but they do not give the least Intimation, that the Memorial was to God; and we shall see hereafter, that it is not necessary to understand them to mean by offer to offer the Bread and Wine as a material Sacrifice to God, but to bring and devote them to be used in his Service according to his Direction, or actually so to use them.

This Author goes on, p. 17. — "The Point in hand will clearly appear from the express Words

“ Words of all the antient Liturgies. In that  
 “ of St. Clement, speaking to God, *We commem-*  
 “ *orate his (viz. Christ's Death) and Passion,*  
 “ *Ec. ——— do offer to thee, our King and our*  
 “ *God, this Bread and this Cup according to his*  
 “ *Institution, beseeching thee to look graciously on*  
 “ *these our Gifts, laid in thy Presence.* In that  
 “ of Jerusalem, called St. James's, *We offer to*  
 “ *thee this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice.* In  
 “ several others, *We offer this mystical and*  
 “ *unbloody Sacrifice.* In all of them we find  
 “ *προσφέρωμεν, We offer.* Now does it not appear  
 “ plain from hence, that they thought the Me-  
 “ morial, which Christ commanded, was to be  
 “ made to God?” To which I answer, No, be-  
 cause it is here neither said, nor implied, that  
 the Memorial was made to God. In St. Cle-  
 ment's Liturgy there are indeed these Words,  
*We commemorate his Death and Passion;* but, for  
 any Thing that appears to the contrary, they  
 may mean, *We commemorate them ourselves,* and  
 not *commemorate them to God;* and as this Pas-  
 sage is expressed in the *Appendix,* it manifestly  
 signifies *commemorating his Death and Passion*  
 themselves, as thus, *Wherefore having in Re-*  
*membrance, instead of We commemorate, his Pas-*  
*sion, Ec. we offer to thee our King, Ec.* And,  
 upon due Examination the same will be found  
 true of all other Testimonies from antient Li-  
 turgies, and likewise from antient Councils set  
 down in this *Appendix.*

This Author next proceeds to prove, that, ac-  
 cording to the Sense and Practice of our Church,  
*a Representation of Christ's Death and Passion is*  
*made to God,* from its Communion Office, and  
 in that particularly from the Prayer of Consecra-  
 tion

## 144 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

tion. And to prove, that in that Prayer the Priest applies to God for the Benefits of *Christ's* Death and Passion, by reminding him, and presenting to him, what *Christ* did, and commanded to be done, he thus argues: "He, that is, *the Priest*, says to God, *grant that we receiving these thy Creatures*. He calls them *God's Creatures* in a more special Manner, as being presented, dedicated, or offered to him in Memory of *Christ*." But I deny, that it is the Design of the Church to call the Bread and Wine here *God's Creatures* in a more especial Manner, nor does any Reason appear, that it is so. "Then he makes before God a Representation of the Sacrifice of *Christ*: He takes the Elements, and holds them to and before God, breaking the Bread, to make a Memorial to God of *Christ's* Body, torn with Nails upon the Cross, and pours out the Wine and takes it up, as a Memorial of *Christ's* Blood shed for us;" but the Church directs the Priest to take and break the Bread, and to take the Cup, to make a Representation and Memorial of *Christ's* Body broken and Blood shed to the People, and not to God; as appears from the Rubrick before this Prayer, which is this; *When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more Readiness and Decency break the Bread before the People, and take the Cup into his Hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.* Where it is plain from the Church's directing the Priest so to order the Bread and Wine, that he may, with the more Readiness and Decency, break the Bread before the People, and take the Cup into his Hands, that she designs, that *Christ's* Body broken



broken and Blood shed, should be represented to the People. But she says not a Word of holding the Elements *to or before* God to represent *Christ's* Body broken and Blood shed to him; neither does she direct the Priest to pour out the Wine, while he is saying this Prayer, "laying his Hands upon both, to signify, that on him were laid the Sins of the World;" the Church does not direct the Priest to lay his Hands upon the Bread and Wine to signify, that on *Christ* were laid the Sins of the World; but to set them apart from a common to an holy Use; by appointing them to be the Signs and Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*. And for these Reasons I think, that it will not only bear a Question, whether the Sacrifice of *Christ's* Death is here represented *to God*, or whether only *to the People*? But that it is certain it is represented only to the People.

As a farther Proof, that *Christ* was offered before he was slain or crucified upon the Cross, Mr. *Boycer* says, that "all the Sacrifices were first offered, whilst alive, and then slain upon the Altar." By Sacrifices I suppose he Means the Sacrifices under the Law of *Moses*; but the *Old Testament* does not teach, that the Sacrifices were offered before they were slain, but the contrary. It is said indeed in the first and third Chapters of *Leviticus*, that the Man who brings an Offering to the Lord, should offer it before it was slain; but this Offering means only a *devoting*, or resigning it up to be used in the Service of God; and not a *sacrificial* Offering of it; not an Offering of it in Sacrifice, as a material Sacrifice; this was done by the Priest only upon the

# 146 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the Altar, by consuming some part of the Beast there, which was sacrificed<sup>a</sup>.

Dr. Brett next says, "that to offer is to perform an Action, to bear is to be passive; now *Christ* was active, performed a solemn Action, when he celebrated the Eucharist; but was perfectly passive, when he was crucified."

Whence the Doctor infers, that *Christ* did not offer himself, when he was crucified upon the Cross. But it is not true, that *Christ* was perfectly passive, when he was crucified. He was then active; performed the solemn Act of Resignation; voluntarily resigning up his Life to God, a Ransom for the Sins of Men. For he could easily have rescued himself, if he had pleased, out of the Hands of the Soldiers, who nailed him to the Cross. By which Action he very sufficiently and plainly offered himself upon the Cross. And to say, that *Christ* was only passive, when he was crucified, is directly contrary to what he himself says, *John* x. 15, 17, 18.

*I lay down my Life for the Sheep. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my Life, that I might take it again. No Man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself.*

And as the Reasons given to prove, that *Christ* offered himself, when he instituted the Lord's Supper, and not upon the Cross, do not prove this; so may it be plainly proved from Scripture, that *Christ* did offer himself upon the Cross. *Heb.* ix. 25, 26. St. Paul says, *Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest entreteth into the Holy Place every Year with Blood of others: (For then must he often have suffered since the*

<sup>a</sup> See Mr. Wingfield's *Lord's Supper not a Sacrifice*, p. 49.

*Foundation of the World*) but now *once in the End of the World*, hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself. In which Words to offer, to suffer, and the Sacrifice of himself, are synonymous, they signify the same Transaction of Christ relating to his atoning for the Sins of Men; and to suffer, signifies his suffering Death. It manifestly signifies that Suffering, by which he put away the Sins of Men; but it was by suffering Death that he put away Sin. Therefore where Christ suffered Death, there he offered and sacrificed himself; but he suffered Death upon the Cross; therefore upon the Cross did he offer and sacrifice himself.

Again Heb. x. 10. St. Paul says, *By the which Will we are sanctified, through the Offering of the Body of Jesus once for all*; and Ver. 14. *For by one Offering hath he perfected for ever them that are sanctified*. In which Words by *sanctified*, is signified, *having their Sins atoned for*. But it was by actually laying down his Life, by his real and actual Death, that Christ atoned for Men's Sins; and their Sins were not atoned for, 'till he had been actually put to Death. Since then as the Apostle asserts in these Words, Christ by offering himself atoned for the Sins of Men, he offered himself, when he actually laid down his Life, when he submitted to undergo a real and actual Death; but this he did upon the Cross; and therefore there he offered himself.

*The Sacrament of the Altar* says, p. xxxviii. That our Author " gives a wild parallel between " the Paschal Supper and the Lord's Supper. I " say a wild parallel; for he makes the Lord's " Supper answer to the Paschal Supper, not in " that which is eaten in the Lord's Supper is of-  
what
L 2
" fered



148 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“fered to God, as that was, which was eaten in  
 “the Paschal Supper; but merely because in  
 “both there is a *commemorative* Eating. But if  
 “this be all the Agreement between them, I  
 “confess I cannot see Agreement enough to say,  
 “that the *one* answers to the *other*; —  
 “for *one* Thing is said to answer *another*, or two  
 “Things said to *answer one* the *other*, when  
 “they agree together in the *Main*: But the Pas-  
 “chal Supper was a Feast on a *commemorative*  
 “Sacrifice: If therefore the Lord’s Supper be not  
 “a Feast on a *commemorative* Sacrifice; it will  
 “be an hard Matter to shew an understanding  
 “Man, wherein they do agree together so suffi-  
 “ciently, as that the *one* may be said to answer  
 “to the *other*.” But I think it no hard Matter  
 to shew any understanding Man, that the *Pas-*  
*chal Supper* and the *Lord’s Supper*, do so suffi-  
 ciently agree together, as that the *one* may be said  
 to answer to the *other*, although the *Paschal Sup-*  
*per* was a Feast on a *commemorative* Sacrifice, on  
 some material Thing, which had been offered in  
 Sacrifice to God, and the *Lord’s Supper* be not a  
 Feast on such a *commemorative* Sacrifice, on any  
 material Thing offered in Sacrifice to God; and  
 that upon the Principles laid down by this Au-  
 thor in the Words here cited. In them he says,  
 “*one* Thing is said to answer to *another*, or  
 “two Things are said to *answer one* the *other*,  
 “when they agree together in the *main*.” Now  
 I think, that two Things do agree in the *main*,  
 when they agree in the *main* or *principal* End  
 and Design of them; and the *Paschal Supper* and  
 the *Lord’s Supper* do agree in the *main* and *prin-*  
*cipal* End and Design of them, though what was  
 eaten in the *one*, was offered as a material Sacri-  
 fice

fice to God, and what is eaten and drunk in the *other*, be not so offered. For the *main* or *principal* End and Design of the *Paschal Supper* was not to eat of a Lamb, which had been offered in Sacrifice to God; but to eat of a Lamb in Memory of the Deliverance of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*; And the *main* and *principal* End and Design of the *Lord's Supper* is to eat Bread and drink Wine in Memory of the Deliverance of Mankind from Sin by *Jesus Christ*. This is certain and undeniable with regard to the *Paschal Supper*, that being the only End of it mentioned in the *Old Testament*; and if it should be said with regard to the *Lord's Supper*, that it is a Point disputed in the present Controversy; yet then our Adversaries can no more deny it to invalidate this Argument, than I can suppose it to support this Argument. However this shews, that the *Paschal Supper* and the *Lord's Supper* may agree in their *main* and *principal* End and Design, though the *Lamb* in the *one* had been offered in Sacrifice to God, and the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *other* had not been so offered. And when two Things do agree in their *Main* and *principal* End and Design, they do so sufficiently agree, as that the *one* may be said to answer to the *other*.

Page 40. This Author finds Fault with that Passage of our Author, "That, which answers  
" in the *Christian* Dispensation to the *Paschal*  
" *Lamb*, is *Christ* himself, offered by himself  
" on the Cross." He denies not, but that *Christ*  
does answer to the first original *Paschal Lamb*;  
but that *Christ* himself, offered by himself, an-  
swers to the *Paschal Lamb* in the subsequent,  
annual, commemorative *Paschal Supper*, he

150 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

says, is not to be allowed; " for this Lamb was  
 " a *commemorative* Sacrifice, representative and  
 " commemorative of the first original Paschal  
 " Lamb; but *Christ* himself, offered by himself,  
 " was an *original* Sacrifice, and not *commemora-*  
 " *tive* or *representative* of any preceding Sacri-  
 " fice." But cannot *Christ* himself offered by  
 himself, answer to the Paschal Lamb in the an-  
 nual Paschal Supper, unless *Christ* was a *commemorative* and *representative* Sacrifice, as that Lamb  
 was? Is there no other Relation, whereby *Christ*  
 can answer to that Lamb? May not that Lamb  
 be *commemorative* and *representative* of the first  
 original Lamb, and also *prefigurative* and *representative* of the Lamb, slain indeed in the Divine  
 Foreknowledge and Appointment before the  
 Foundation of the World; but not actually slain  
 until *Christ* suffered Death upon the Cross? And  
 may not *Christ* answer to this Lamb as the *Archetype*  
 to the *Type*? Yes certainly. And in this  
 respect nothing either in the Lord's Supper, or  
 in the *Christian* Dispensation, answers either to  
 the first *original Paschal Lamb*, or to the *subse-*  
*quent annual Paschal Lamb*, but *Christ* himself  
 offered by himself on the Cross.

To this Passage of our Author, p. 47. " that  
 " the only Thing in the *Christian* Dispensation,  
 " which answers to any of the legal Sacrifices,  
 " but indeed is far more excellent in its Nature  
 " and Design than them all, is the Death of  
 " *Christ*;" this Author objects thus; " I de-  
 " sire the Reader to consider, that all the legal  
 " Sacrifices——were no farther acceptable to  
 " God, than as they were considered by him, as  
 " Representations of the grand Sacrifice of *Christ*'s  
 " Death; —— whereas, on the contrary, the  
 " personal



“ personal Sacrifice of *Christ* was not *Representative* of any other Sacrifice, but acceptable to God by its *own intrinsic* Worth and Excellency; — these Things being duly considered, I shall leave it to the judicious Reader to determine, *how far* it may be allowable to say, that the *personal* Sacrifice of *Christ* answers to any of the *legal* Sacrifices, or whether such a Way of speaking be at all allowable. ” But why is it not allowable to say, that the *personal* Sacrifice of *Christ* answers to the *legal* Sacrifices, because the Sacrifice of *Christ* was acceptable to God by its *own intrinsic* Worth and Excellency, and the *legal* Sacrifices were acceptable to God, as they were Representations of the grand Sacrifice of *Christ*? May not the *personal* Sacrifice of *Christ*, notwithstanding this, answer to the *legal* Sacrifices, as the *Archetype* to the *Type*, as that was the grand Sacrifice, of which the *legal* Sacrifices were the *Types* and *Prefigurations*? And as those Sacrifices were *expiatory* or *propitiatory* Sacrifices, offered under the Law, so *Christ* was the only *expiatory* or *propitiatory* Sacrifice offered under the *Christian* Dispensation? Yes certainly. And in this Sense the Death of *Christ* is the only Thing in the *Christian* Dispensation, which answers to the *legal* Sacrifices; and in this Sense does our Author affirm it to be so.

Page 48. This Author says, that our Author asserts, “ that the only Person, who answers to “ any *Jewish* Priest, considered as a *Sacrificer*, is “ *Jesus Christ* himself, who offered himself up.” But, says he, “ We have proved, that *Christ* “ commissioned his Apostles, and in them their “ Successors and Substitutes, to offer a *Representative*

152 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

"*sative Sacrifice* ; therefore his Assertion is  
"groundless." And I have proved, that this  
Author has not proved *this* ; therefore his Assertion,  
that he has proved it, is groundless.

But Mr. Johnson, Dr. Brett says, proves, that  
by eating in that Text of St. Paul, *Heb. x. 13* is  
meant *oral eating*. This Mr. Johnson says appears  
from what goes before and what follows.  
"In the foregoing Verse the Apostle had said,  
"It is a good Thing that the Heart be strengthened  
"or refreshed with Grace, that is, with Evangelical  
"Mercies and Blessings, and not with such  
"Meats, as the Jews used to eat in their Festivals,  
"and their Peace-Offerings, which had not  
"profited them, that had been occupied therein,  
"so as to purge their Conscience from dead  
"Works ; these Meats were, without Doubt,  
"orally eaten ; to these Meats he opposes  
"what Christians receive from their Altar." And  
from hence Mr. Johnson infers, that what Christians  
receive from their Altar is also orally  
eaten.

But supposing that what Christians receive  
from their Altar is opposed to these Meats ; yet  
this Inference does not follow from it, except  
whatever is opposed to these Meats, be also  
orally eaten ; but it is not so. For in this Verse  
Grace is opposed to these Meats ; and yet Grace  
is not orally eaten.

But the following Words, Mr. Johnson says,  
make this still more clear, that by eating is meant  
oral eating ; in which Words St. Paul proves  
what he had here laid down, viz. That neither  
Priest nor People, so long as they served the

*Jewish* Tabernacle or Temple, had any Right to eat from the *Christian Altar*. "For, says he, "the Bodies of those Beasts, whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary, are burnt without the Camp, and therefore could not possibly be eaten by those, who were in the Temple or Tabernacle; and he proves, that our Saviour's was such a Sacrifice, because he suffered without the Gate. Now this does most apparently prove, that the *Jewish Priests and People* could not orally eat from off the *Christian Altar*, upon Supposition we have then a Sacrifice for Sin, whose Blood has been carried in to the Sanctuary."

According to this Way of representing the Apostle's Arguing, the Argument contained in these Words to prove, That they had no Right to eat of the *Christian Altar*, who served the Tabernacle, is this; *The Bodies of those Beasts, whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary, are burnt without the Camp*, and therefore could not possibly be eaten orally by those; who were in the Temple or Tabernacle, they being to be totally consumed by Fire. But *Christ* is such a Sacrifice; for he suffered without the Gate: Therefore they, who serve the Tabernacle, adhere to the Laws and Rules of it, can have no Right to eat of the Sacrifice of *Christ* offered upon the *Christian Altar*, it being contrary to those Rules of the Tabernacle, which they adhere to. Now this Argument supposes the Suffering of *Christ* without the Gate to answer, or be parallel to the Burning of the Bodies of those Beasts without the Camp: For not only the Bodies of those Beasts were burnt without the Camp, whose Blood was carried into the Sanctuary upon the great Day of



of Expiation; but also the Bodies of all Beasts which were offered for a Sin offering, whose Blood was brought into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile in the Holy Place. But the *Suffering of Christ without the Gate* does not answer to the *burning of the Bodies of those Beasts without the Camp*. And therefore the Apostle does not argue in this Place, as Mr. *Johnson* represents him to do; and by Consequence what is built upon the Supposition of his arguing in that Manner falls, which is, that by *eating* here is meant *oral eating*.

- That the *Suffering of Christ without the Gate* does not answer to the *Burning of the Bodies of those Beasts without the Camp*, will be manifest to any one, who reads an Account of those Sacrifices in *Leviticus*, and considers the Sacrifice of *Christ*. For the Bodies of those Beasts were burnt after they had been put to Death, and the Atonement made with them, to make which, they were sacrificed; but *Christ* did not suffer after he was put to Death, and the Atonement made by him, to make which he was sacrificed. For it was at his being put to Death that he suffered, and made the Atonement. That, which the *Suffering of Christ* answers to, is the *slaying* of the Beast, and *offering* them upon the Altar.

And as it thus appears, that the Apostle cannot be supposed to argue here, as Mr. *Johnson* represents him to do; so, I apprehend, that the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Verses of this Chapter are not designed for a Reason, why *they, who serve the Tabernacle, had no Right to eat of the Christian*

\* See *Levit. iv. 11, 21. and vi. 30.*

*Altar*; but as a Reason to persuade Persons to leave the Ritual Law of *Moses*, and adhere to the Gospel only. The 9<sup>th</sup> Verse, is an Argument for this Purpose; by shewing the Unprofitableness of the Ritual Law; that it *had not profited them, who had been occupied therein*; and that it was better to adhere to the Gospel only, trusting to the Sacrifice of *Christ* alone. Verse 10<sup>th</sup> is another Argument to the same Purpose, by telling them, that, if they adhered to the Ritual Law, *they could not receive, or had no Right to receive, any Benefit from the Sacrifice of Christ*; which is expressed by that figurative Expression, *have no Right to eat of the Altar, which Christians have*; that they had no Right to partake of, or receive any Benefit from the Sacrifice of *Christ* offered upon the Altar of the Cross. And the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Verses contain another Argument to the same Purpose, implying, That, by exhorting them to forsake the Ritual Law, or the Service of the Tabernacle, he exhorted them to nothing, but what was prefigured or signified by the *Jewish Ordinances, viz. That Men were some time or another to leave the Service of the Tabernacle, and go without the Camp, in order to obtain the Pardon of their Sins*; as thus: *The Bodies of those Beasts, which were offered for a Sin-Offering, and whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the High Priest, are burnt without the Camp*; by which is signified, that the Sin-Offering was not always to remain, and be contained within the Camp, and by Consequence that Persons were not always to remain within the Camp, and serve the Tabernacle, and continue to observe the Service of it, in order to obtain the Remission of Sins. *Wherefore to signify,*  
that

156 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

that the Time was now come, when Persons were not to expect the Pardon of their Sins by keeping within the Camp and Tabernacle, and adhering to the Service of the Tabernacle, *Jesus also*, who is the grand and only true Sacrifice for the Sins of Men, *when he suffered, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffered without the Gate*; to signify, that, in order to be Partakers of the Atonement made by him, they should leave the Tabernacle. *Let us therefore go forth to him without the Camp*, forsaking the Service of the Tabernacle, which consisted only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Washings, and carnal Ordinances, which could not make Men perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience. This I apprehend to be the Manner of the Apostle's arguing in this Place, and to eat of the Christian Altar to signify not oral eating, but to partake of the Benefits of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Altar of the Cross; of which Benefits, he says, they have no Right to partake, who adhere to the Ritual Law, and place any Trust in that for obtaining Remission of Sins; agreeable to what he says, *Galat. v. 2, 3. Behold, I Paul say unto you; that, if ye be circumcised, if ye still observe Circumcision, and the other Rites of the Law of Moses, to observe which you oblige yourselves at Circumcision, in order to obtain Salvation, trusting that the Observance of them will be an help towards it, Christ shall profit you nothing. Christ is become of no Effect to you, whoever of you are justified by the Law, that is, seek or expect to be justified by the Ritual Law, ye are fallen from Grace.* After what has been already said, I think there is no Occasion to say any thing in Answer to what the Sacrament of the



*the Altar* says to prove, that in this Passage of *St. Paul*, by *Altar* is meant the *Communion Table*, p. 57. &c.

*Dr. Brett* next says, Page 64, "That this Parallel also, which *St. Paul* makes between the Sacrifice of *Christ*, and the *Sin-Offering* under the Law, is a farther Proof, that *Christ* offered himself in the *Eucharist*, and not on the Cross." But this farther Argument taken from this Parallel, is founded upon the Supposition, that the *Suffering of Christ upon the Cross* answers to the *Burning of the Bodies of the Beasts without the Camp*; which I have shewn not to be true; and therefore this Argument, founded upon it, must be inconclusive.

And now I think, I may venture to affirm, in Opposition to what *Doctor Brett* says, Page 65, That I have shewn from Scripture, that the Cross did answer to the *Jewish Altar*, and not to the Place without the Camp, where the *Sin-Offering* was burnt; that *Christ* did offer himself upon the Cross; that it appears from Scripture, that he offered himself and suffered at the same Time; and that he suffered and bore our Sins on the Cross, and consequently offered himself, when he was crucified; that it does not appear from Scripture, that he made any other Oblation of himself here on Earth, than what he made upon the Cross; that *Christ* could offer himself a Sacrifice in some other Manner, than by Symbols and Representations, without in any Manner putting himself to Death, and giving too just a Reason to accuse him of Self-Murder; and that the Manner in which he did offer himself a Sacrifice, was by resigning and submitting himself to be put to Death by the *Jews* and *Soldiers*: And that when *Christ* ordered his Apostles to do, as he had

had done, it does not appear, that this implied a Command to offer Bread and Wine, because it does not appear, that *Christ* offered Bread and Wine when he instituted the Eucharist.

Dr. *Brett* next cites a Passage from our Author, wherein he says, "That the Lord's Supper was instituted as a Rite for the Remembrance of *Christ's* Death once past;" to which the Doctor agrees; but contends farther, that the Bread and Wine are to be offered, as *Christ* commanded us to do, as Memorials of his Death. The Difference therefore here between the Doctor and our Author is this; our Author asserts, that the Remembrance of *Christ's* Death, for which the Lord's Supper was instituted, respects Men, that it is to bring his Death to the Remembrance of Men; the Doctor asserts, that this Remembrance or Memorial respects God, and that it is to bring the Death of *Christ* in Remembrance before God, and that therefore the Bread and Wine are to be offered to God as Memorials of *Christ's* Death. So likewise with regard to that Passage quoted by our Author from St. *Chrysostom*, who says of the Lord's Supper, *I call it a Sacrifice; but indeed it is not a Sacrifice, but the Memorial of a Sacrifice.* Mr. *Johnson*, in his Answer to it, which Dr. *Brett* has transcribed, agrees that the Lord's Supper is only a *Commemorative Sacrifice*; but then he contends, the Commemoration or Memorial of it respects God, and that it is to bring the Sacrifice of *Christ* in Remembrance before God; and therefore the Bread and Wine are to be offered to him for that Purpose. And this Dr. *Brett* and Mr. *Johnson* endeavour to prove in this Place, as does also Mr. *Bowyer*,

Bowyer, p. 43. from the peculiar Signification of the Word *ἀνάμνησις*.

But before I proceed to consider their Arguments, I must take Notice, that with regard to this Passage of St. Chrysostom, the Sacrament of the Altar, charges our Author both with an *unfair* Quotation, and an *unfair* Construction, p. 50.

The Words of St. Chrysostom he says are, *τὸ αὐτὸν θυσιάζον ἀνὰ μνήμην*. But I do not see how the leaving out *τὸ αὐτὸν* does at all alter the Sense of St. Chrysostom here; and therefore there can be no Reason to charge our Author with *Unfairness* for either quoting or construing this Passage, as he hath done, or to give the less Credit to him upon that Account, as this Author insinuates to his Reader. As to the Observation, that *ἱερὰ ἕρποντα* is a *sacrificial* Term, it is of no Signification, and the same may be said of *ἱερὰ ἕρποντα*, that is said of *πρὸς* hereafter.

Dr. Brett and Mr. Bowyer say, that *ἀνάμνησις* is a *sacrificial* Word, and signifies a Memorial very consistent with an Offering. I wish they had explained, what they mean by a *sacrificial* Word; but in the present Case, I think they must mean one of these two Things, if they mean any Thing to their Purpose: either that *ἀνάμνησις* properly signifies a Memorial respecting God only, the putting of God in Remembrance by some Oblation or Sacrifice being offered to him, and that it cannot be properly used in any other Sense, as to signify a Memorial respecting Men, or the putting of Men in Mind; or they mean the same that Mr. Johnson does, who says, that the critical Meaning of the Word *ἀνάμνησις*, when applied to sacrificing, is that Portion of the Oblation, which being in a particular Manner offer-



ed to God, did bring the whole Oblation in Remembrance before him, such Portions, as are particularly mentioned to be offered to God, *Levit. ii. 2, 9, 16.* Now in which soever of these two Senses we understand them, when they call *ἀνάμνησις* a *sacrificial* Word, it cannot be proved, that there is any *Peculiarity* in the Signification of *ἀνάμνησις*, so that it properly signifies a Memorial or Remembrance respecting God, and not Men; nor by consequence that there is any Reason, from the peculiar Sense of that Word, to understand it in the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper to signify a Memorial or Remembrance to God, and not a Memorial or Remembrance to Men.

First then, suppose *ἀνάμνησις* does signify, when applied to *sacrificing*, that Portion of the Oblation, which being in a particular Manner offered to God, did bring the whole Oblation in Remembrance before him; or that Part of the Offering, with which the Atonement is made; yet it does not follow, that it signifies the same, when applied to the Lord's Supper in the Words of the Institution, except we suppose, that the Lord's Supper is a Sacrifice, and that the Bread and Wine therein are to be offered to God, which is the Point to be proved; and therefore must not be supposed to support that Sense of the Word *ἀνάμνησις*, which is brought to prove it. For tho' the Meaning of *ἀνάμνησις* be that Portion of the Oblation, which, being in a particular Manner offered to God, did bring the whole Oblation in Remembrance before him, or that Part of the Oblation, by which the Atonement was made, when manifestly and certainly applied to *sacrificing*; when applied to that, which was certainly

tainly and undoubtedly a Sacrifice, wherein something was undoubtedly offered in Sacrifice to God; yet it does not from thence follow, that the Meaning of it is the same, when applied to that, which is not certainly and undoubtedly a Sacrifice, and where it is doubtful, nay, not only doubtful, whether any material Thing is offered in Sacrifice to God, but very probable, that there is not.

Neither, secondly, can it be proved, that *ἀνάμνησις* does in the general properly signify a Memorial respecting God only, the putting of God in Mind by some Oblation or Sacrifice offered to him, and that it cannot be properly used in any other Sense, as to signify a Memorial respecting Men, or the putting of Men in Mind. To prove this it is alledged, that *ἀνάμνησις* is used but twice in the *Septuagint*, viz. *Levit. xxiv. 7.* and *Numb. x. 10.* and that in both these Places it signifies a Memorial respecting God; from whence it is inferred, that it properly signifies only such a Memorial. To which I answer, that in both these Places the Memorial does respect God; but in neither of them is the Memorial made by any Thing being offered as a material Sacrifice to God. In the first Instance the Frankincense, which was for the Memorial, seems only to be placed upon the Bread for a Memorial, and not to be offered in Sacrifice to God for a Memorial: and in the other Instance there does not appear to be any Thing offered to make the Memorial. For the *blowing with the Trumpets* is the Memorial there mentioned, and by *blowing with them* was the Memorial made; and surely it will not be said, that the *blowing with the Trumpets* was offered as a material Sacrifice. And it is strange,

M

that

that *The Sacrament of the Altar* should affirm, p. 12. "That ἀνάμνησις, or *Memorial*, is the same Word, which is used in the *Mosaic Law* for that Part of the Offering, wherewith the Atonement was made," when it is not once used in the *Mosaic Law* in that Sense. For ἀνάμνησις is used only in the two Places above cited in the whole *Mosaic Law*, and in neither of those Places does it signify, *that Part of the Offering, wherewith the Atonement was made*. For in neither of those Places is there any Thing said to be offered, as a propitiatory Sacrifice to make an Atonement; and then ἀνάμνησις cannot in those Places signify, *that Part of the Offering, wherewith the Atonement was made*. And hence it appears, that there is no Reason from the Use of ἀνάμνησις in the *Mosaic Law* to prove, that ἀνάμνησις is so a *sacrificial Term*, as that it is manifestly plain from our Saviour's using it at the Institution of the Lord's Supper, that he intended that Institution to be a material Sacrifice for a perpetual Representation or Memorial of the Sacrifice of himself to God, as this Author argues in this Place; and the same will hereafter appear of the other *sacrificial Term*, viz. δο, or ποίω, here mentioned. Mr. Bowyer also appears to be mistaken, when he asserts, p. 43. that *Numb. x. 10. The Burnt-offerings, and the Sacrifice of the Peace-offerings* were the Memorial.

But tho' in these two Places, ἀνάμνησις be used to signify a Memorial respecting God, or the putting God in Mind; yet it will not from thence follow, that *that* is the peculiar Sense of it, and that it cannot properly be used to signify a Memorial respecting Men, or the putting of Men in Mind. For if this was the peculiar Signification



fication of ἀνάμνησις, it must be also of the Verbs ἀναμνάνω and ἀναμνησκώ, they being the same Compounds from the same Theme, and they too must properly signify only to put God in Mind. But they are frequently used to signify putting Men in Mind, and Men's calling to Mind, as *Mark xi. 21. 1 Cor. iv. 17. 2 Cor. vii. 15. 2 Tim. i. 6. Heb. x. 32.* But certainly St. *Mark* and St. *Paul* would not be guilty of such an Impropriety of Language, as to use these Words with regard to the Memory of Man, if they were properly to be used only with regard to the Memory of God. 'Ανάμνησις is used but once in the whole New Testament, except in those Passages, which regard the Lord's Supper, and in that Place, *Heb. x. 3.* it signifies the Remembrance of Man. It there plainly signifies that *Remembrance* or *Consciousness* of Sins, of the Guilt of them still remaining, and their not being atoned for, which *Remembrance* and *Consciousness* the Worshippers would not have had; had they been *made perfect*, had their Sins been perfectly atoned for, by those Sacrifices, which were offered under the Law. 'Ανάμνησις cannot here signify a *Remembrance of Sins* respecting God, or the putting of God in Mind of Sins. For the Remembrance or Memorial here spoken of was made by the Sacrifices offered by the *Jews* either in their daily Service, or upon the great Day of Expiation. *Numb. xxviii. Levit. xvi.* By these Sacrifices the Remembrance or Memorial of Sins could be no otherwise made to God, but either by those Sacrifices being offered to him, or by the High-Priest's confessing all the Iniquities of the Children of *Israel* upon the great Day of Atonement. But Sacrifices

164 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

were never offered to God, nor Sins confessed to him, that he might remember them, but that he might forget them. *Ἀνάμνησις* is also used by *Aristotle*, to signify the Memory of Man in his *Ethics*, Lib. iii. p. 132.

*Levit. xxiii. 24.* *Μνημόσυον* is used to signify the same Memorial of Trumpets, which *ἀνάμνησις* is used to signify, *Numb. x. 10.* and yet it is not the proper and peculiar Sense of *μνημόσυον*, to signify a Memorial respecting God, as appears by its being so often used in the *Septuagint*, to signify a Memorial respecting Men; neither therefore can it be concluded, that *ἀνάμνησις* properly signifies only a Memorial respecting God, because it is used in that Sense, *Numb. x. 10.* and its being used in one Place only, *viz. Levit. xxiv. 7.* to signify a Memorial respecting God, certainly cannot prove that to be the proper and peculiar Sense of it.

If it was the peculiar Signification of *ἀνάμνησις*, to signify a Memorial respecting God only, it is strange, that the Writers of the *Septuagint* should but twice use that Word, when they speak of a Memorial respecting God, but use the Word *μνημόσυον*, and that too when they call that Portion of the Oblation, which was offered to God, a \**Memorial*, or that Part of the Offering, by which the Atonement was made, as *Levit. ii. 2, 9, 16.* and *v. 12.* and *vi. 15.* and *Numb. v. 26.* Which is an Argument, that *ἀνάμνησις* does properly signify neither that Part of the Oblation, which being in a peculiar Manner offered to God did bring the whole Oblation in Remembrance before him, nor a Memorial respecting God, nor that Part of the Offering, by which the Atonement was made. From all which I think it reasonable

sonable to conclude, that there is not any *Peculiarity* in the Signification of the Word *ἀνάμνησις*, so that it properly signifies a Memorial or Remembrance respecting God only, and not a Memorial or Remembrance respecting Men; and by consequence that there is no Reason, from the *peculiar* Sense of that Word, to understand it, in the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, to signify a Memorial or Remembrance to God, and not a Memorial or Remembrance to Men.

I shall now venture to assert, in Opposition to what Dr. Brett says he hath shewn, p. 69. That there is no Reason to understand St. Chrysostom, when he calls the Lord's Supper *the Memorial of a Sacrifice*, to mean a Memorial respecting God, made by offering the Bread and Wine to him therein; that the Reasons given by the Members of the Church of *England* to prove, that it is such a Memorial or a Commemorative Sacrifice in that Sense, are insufficient to prove this; and that tho' a Memorial may be a Sacrifice, as well as the antient Sacrifices were Prefigurations, yet it does not from thence follow, that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, tho' it be a Memorial; because there may be a Memorial to Men, if not to God, without a Sacrifice.

Dr. Brett proceeds, and says, "That he will now shew what Grounds we have to believe the Holy Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, and to offer it as such." And the first Argument he produces to prove this, is the Authority of the Fathers: but as there are some other Texts of Scripture brought to prove this, besides those already taken Notice of, I shall first consider these before I consider what the Fathers say.



166 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

The first Text, I shall take Notice of, is that of St. *Matth. v. 23, 24. If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there remembreſt, that thy Brother hath ought againſt thee; leave there thy Gift before the Altar, and go thy Way, firſt be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift.* This Text is alſo brought by Mr. *Bowyer* to prove, that the Lord's Supper is a material Sacrifice, p. 45. From which Precept it is argued thus, that it appears from it, that *Chriſt* intended to have an Altar in his Church; and, if ſo, then he intended to leave a Sacrifice to be offered upon it. For by Altar in this Text, *Chriſt* could not mean the *Jewiſh* Altar in the Temple, and therefore he muſt mean an Altar in the *Chriſtian* Church. In answer to which I ask, Why could not *Chriſt* mean the Altar in the *Jewiſh* Temple? It is ſaid, For the Reasons given by Mr. *Mede*; let us therefore conſider, whether theſe Reasons are ſufficient to prove, that by the Altar in this Text *Chriſt* could not, and did not, mean the *Jewiſh* Altar.

The firſt Reason is, that there was no ſuch Thing commanded in the Law to ſuch as came to offer Sacrifice; and that it is altogether improbable our Saviour would annex a new Rite to the legal Sacrifices, when he was ſo ſoon after to aboliſh them. To which I answer, That the Thing commanded in this Precept is, that Perſons ſhould not offer their Gifts to God at his Altar, without being reconciled to and in Charity with their Brethren; and tho' this is not commanded in expreſs Words in the Law, yet it is implied in that Precept, to *love their Neighbour as themſelves, Levit. xix. 18.* In this Precept there is doubtleſs implied a reaſonable Reconciliation; if

one

one Person had injured another, that he should offer and make him all reasonable Satisfaction, and laying aside the malevolent Disposition he had towards him, when he injured him, should be kindly affectioned towards him. For otherwise he cannot be said to love him as himself; this being what any Person would desire another to do towards himself. And if they were required, and it was their Duty to be thus reconciled to their Brethren at all Times, it was doubtless their Duty to have this charitable Disposition of Mind, when they approached God to offer up their Devotions to him; when they brought their Gifts to offer them to him at his Altar; otherwise their Offerings could not be acceptable. And therefore by this Command *Christ* annexed no new Rite to the legal Sacrifices, but only commanded them to do that, which it was always their Duty to do. It was always the Duty of the *Jews* to be reconciled to their Brethren, when they offered their Gifts; and *if they brought their Gift to the Altar*, in order to offer it, *and there remembred, that their Brother had ought against them*, that they had done him any Injury, for which they had not made him Satisfaction, and were not reconciled to him, they should forbear to offer their Gift, because they could not offer it worthily, and so as that it would be accepted; *and first go and be reconciled to their Brother, and then come and offer their Gift*. As to those Words, *leave there thy Gift before the Altar*, they are plainly not to be understood literally, but figuratively, signifying, *forbear to offer thy Gift*; and were as well fulfilled, if a Person left his Gift at any other Place, as just before the Altar, or if he carried it along with him. And

it was well worth our Saviour's while, and very suitable to the End of his coming, that he should instruct, and command the *Jews* rightly and acceptably to perform the ritual Parts of the Law, while it was to continue in Force; especially when it was to continue in Force for two or three Years longer from the Time when he delivered this Precept, and the due Observance of it tended better to qualify, and more to dispose Persons, to embrace the Gospel.

Secondly, It is said, that the Doctrine in this Text, is a Doctrine *Evangelical*. To which I answer, that if by a Doctrine *Evangelical* be meant a practical Doctrine, the Performance of which was not required before the Coming of *Christ*, I deny, that it is an *Evangelical* Doctrine; because from what has been said to the first Reason, it appears this Doctrine was required to be practiced under the Law. If by a Doctrine *Evangelical* be meant a practical Doctrine, which *Christ* intended should be practiced only under the Gospel, and not until the Law was abolished; for the same Reason it appears, that it cannot be an *Evangelical* Doctrine in this Sense. Because, if the Performance of it was required under the Law, *Christ* could never intend, that it should not be practiced until after the Law was abolished. And then, tho' it be an *Evangelical* Doctrine in any Sense, not excluding the Performance of it being required under the Law, and while that was in Force, it may be spoke by *Christ* with regard to the *Jewish* Altar.

Thirdly, It is said, that this is brought, (and that in the first Place) as an Exemplification of that Righteousness, wherein the Citizens of the Kingdom of *Christ* were to outgo the Righteousness



ness of the Scribes and Pharisees. To which I answer, that, if it be brought in as an Exemplification of this, yet if it was required by the Law, it may nevertheless be spoken of the *Jewish* Altar. And it does not appear, that all the Instances mentioned in this Sermon, wherein the Righteousness of *Christians* was to exceed the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, are of such Things, as were not commanded by the Law; but of such Things, with regard to which the Scribes and Pharisees had misinterpreted, and transgressed the Law.

The fourth Reason is another Argument to prove this Passage to be *Evangelical*. But if it be *Evangelical*, it is not *Evangelical* in such a Sense, as to exclude the Performance of it being required by the Law; as appears from what hath been already said; and then, tho' it be *Evangelical*, it may be spoken with regard to the *Jewish* Altar.

And as these Reasons of Mr. Mede are not sufficient to prove, that *Christ* in this Text could not mean the *Jewish* Altar; so I think it most probable, that he did mean the *Jewish* Altar.

First, Because it is more natural to understand *Christ* in this Text of an Altar under the Law, and *Jewish* Dispensation, under which there was an Altar expressly appointed, and Gifts appointed to be brought unto, and offered at it, than of an Altar under the Gospel and *Christian* Dispensation, when *Christ* neither then, when he delivered this Precept, had given any Intimation of an Altar to be appointed under the *Christian* Dispensation, nor afterwards did appoint any to be under it, to which material Gifts were to be brought and offered at it, nor any material Gifts to be brought  
to

to any Altar. It is true indeed the Communion Table, tho' it be no where so called in Scripture, is by *Christians* called the Altar; but it is so called, not because material Gifts are brought and offered in Sacrifice upon it; but because it is made use of in that Service, which is appointed to be performed in Memory of the Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Altar of the Cross; as that thereon are placed the Bread and Wine, which are the Representations and Memorials of the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of *Christ* offered upon the Cross; and because thereat *Christians* perform the Service of eating and drinking this Bread and Wine in Remembrance of that Sacrifice. If it should be said, that the placing the Bread and Wine upon the Table is offering them in Sacrifice, and so here are Gifts offered in Sacrifice upon the Communion Table; I answer, that the placing the Bread and Wine upon the Table is not offering them in Sacrifice. For, if it was, they ought not to be placed there by any but the Priest, it not being lawful for any but a Priest to offer Sacrifices, as our Adversaries allow; but the Bread and Wine may as well be placed upon the Communion Table by a lay Person, as by a Priest; it is no more necessary to the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, that the Bread and Wine be placed upon the Table by a Priest, than by a lay Man; it is not necessary that the Priest, in order duly to celebrate the Lord's Supper, should place the Bread and Wine upon the Table<sup>a</sup>.

Secondly, *Christ* intended, that the Precept contained in this Text should be practiced from

<sup>a</sup> See farther under this Prop.

the Time, at which he gave it; and then he must intend it of the *Jewish* Altar; there being nothing else at that Time, which can be pretended to be an Altar, of which he could mean it, and at which it could be practiced. For as what is contained in this Precept was a moral Duty of the *Jews* under the Law, *Christ* could not but intend, that it should be practiced from the Time he repeated it in this Text. If we suppose, that *Christ* intended this Precept should not be practiced from the Time he delivered it, until he had abolished the Law by his Death; then he must intend to set Men free for that Time from one moral Precept of the Law, *viz.* that of Reconciliation with their Brethren; which it cannot be supposed he would do, and which is contrary to his Declaration, that he *came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them.* *Christ* certainly intended, that the other Precepts given in this Sermon should be practiced from the Time, at which he gave them; and there appears no Reason, why he should not intend, that this likewise should be practiced from the same Time.

Dr. Brett says, p. 182. "There is yet a more  
 " evident Proof to be found in Scripture, even  
 " in the very Words of the Institution, to prove  
 " that we are required to offer the Bread and  
 " Wine to God, when we celebrate the Holy  
 " Eucharist. And that this is in those very  
 " Words, which this Author asserts to be the  
 " most significant of all, and by which all the  
 " rest are to be expounded: *This do in Remem-*  
 " *brance of me.* In which Words *ποιῶν*, translated  
 " to do, signifies also to offer, as does likewise  
 " the Latin Word *facere*, which Dr. Hickes has  
 " proved



## 172 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ proved in his *Christian Priesthood* by a great  
 “ many Instances, a few of which I will trans-  
 “ cribe.” This Argument is also brought by  
 Mr. Bowyer, p. 42. The Instances transcribed  
 by Dr. Brett from Dr. Hickes are as follows:  
 “ *Herodotus*, Lib. i. Cap. 132. says, “*Ἀνευ γὰρ*  
 “ *τῷ Μάγῃ ἔσφι νόμος ἐστὶ θυσίας ποιῆσθαι*, without  
 “ one of the Magi it is not lawful for them to  
 “ offer a Sacrifice. And in the Septuagint, *Exod.*  
 “ xxix. 36. *τὸ βοσχάριον ποιήσεις*, thou shalt of-  
 “ fer a Bullock, & 38. *καὶ τὰντὰ ἐστὶ ἃ ποιήσεις*  
 “ *ἐπὶ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ*, this is that which thou shalt  
 “ offer upon the Altar, & 39. *τὸν ἄμνον τὸν ἑνὸς*  
 “ *ποιήσεις τὸ πρωί, καὶ τὸν ἄμνον τὸν δεύτερον ποιή-*  
 “ *σεις τὸ δειλινόν*, the one Lamb thou shalt offer in  
 “ the Morning, and the other thou shalt offer in  
 “ the Evening. So likewise, *Exod.* x. 25. *καὶ*  
 “ *εἶπε Μωσῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺ δώσεις ἡμῖν ὀλοκαυ-*  
 “ *τώματα καὶ θυσίας, ἃ ποιήσομεν κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ*  
 “ *ἡμῶν*, and Moses said, Thou must give us also  
 “ Sacrifices, and Burnt-Offerings, which we may  
 “ Sacrifice unto the Lord our God. In all which  
 “ Places the Word, which is translated offer,  
 “ and which in this last Text is translated Sa-  
 “ crifice, and which in these and many other  
 “ Places will bear no other Sense, is the very  
 “ Word, which, in the Institution of the Eu-  
 “ charist, is translated do.”

Now by this Way of arguing it may be proved,  
 that *ποιεῖν* signifies to sprinkle, as in *Levit.* xvi.  
 15. where it is commanded, *καὶ ποιήσει τὸ αἷμα*  
*αὐτοῦ, ὃν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸ αἷμα τῷ μόσχῳ*, and he  
 shall do with that Blood, as he did with the Blood  
 of the Bullock; that is, sprinkle it; for that is  
 what was done with the Blood of the Bullock, as  
 appears from the 14<sup>th</sup> Ver. And by the same  
 Way

Way of arguing ποίω may be proved to signify every possible Action in the Universe. The Truth of the Case is, that ποίω in *Greek*, *FACIO* in *Latin*, and *DO* in *English*, signify to *ACT* in general, and they are determined to signify this or that particular Action, or several particular Actions together, either by some Word, which is joined with them, or by referring to some particular Action before mentioned. Thus in the Citation from *Herodotus*, ποιῶ is determined to signify to *offer* by the Word θυσίας joined with it; because Sacrifices are always offered, the Manner of *acting* or *doing* them is by *offering* them; *Exod.* xxix. 36. where the Words in the *Septuagint* are τὸ μυσχάριον ἡ ἁμαρτίας ποιήσεις, where by the Way we may observe, that as this Text is cited in *Dr. Brett's Book*, ἁμαρτίας is omitted, which signifies a *Sin-offering* here; I say in this Place, ποιήσεις is determined to signify to *offer* by the Word ἁμαρτίας joined with it, which shews, that the Bullock, which was to be done, was a *Sin-offering*, and the Way to *do* a *Sin-offering* was to *offer* it; and γ' 38. ποιήσεις is determined to signify to *offer* by the Word θυσιασθῆναι joined with it; because the <sup>a</sup> Use of an Altar was for Sacrifices to be *offered* upon it, and what was *done* upon it was to *offer* Sacrifices; and γ' 39. ποιήσεις is determined to signify to *offer* by referring to the Action enjoined in the preceding Verse, which is to *offer two Lambs Day by Day continually*; *Exod.* x. 25. ποιήσομεν is determined to signify to *offer* by the Words ὀλοκαυτώματα and θυσίας being joined with it; because the Manner of *acting* or *doing* *Sacrifices*

<sup>a</sup> *Gen.* viii. 20. *Exod.* xx. 24.

# 174 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

and *Burnt-offerings* is by offering them; and *Levit. xvi. 15.* *πασχει* and *ἐπιχει* are determined to signify to *sprinkle*, both by referring to the Action enjoined in the preceding Verse concerning the Blood of the Bullock, and also by the Word *παρει* being added immediately after it. So in the Words of the Institution of the Eucharist the Sense of *πασχει* must be determined either by some Word joined to it, or by referring to some particular Actions before mentioned. Now there is no Word joined to it, which can determine it to signify any particular Action, but the Words, which signify the particular Actions, to which it refers. And these Actions are, *Christ's taking the Bread, and giving Thanks or blessing it, and giving it to, and commanding his Disciples to take and eat it, and, what we may suppose to be a Consequence of this, their actual taking and eating it; and Christ's taking the Cup, and giving Thanks, or blessing it, and giving it to, and commanding his Disciples to drink it, and, what we may suppose to be a Consequence of this, their actual drinking of it; and therefore these are the only Actions, which πασχει can signify in the Words of the Institution. There being nothing said to be offered, nor any Command to offer any Thing, nor any Thing mentioned, whose proper and general Use is to be offered in Sacrifice; so as that it implies it was then offered by Christ; there is no Colour of Reason to understand πασχει here to signify to offer.*

Dr. Brett says, p. 42. "That it is farther  
 " manifest, that *πασχει* in the Words of the In-  
 " stitution signifies to offer from the Command  
 " concerning the Cup, which is, *This do ye, as*  
 " *oft as ye drink it in Remembrance of me.* For  
 " except



“ except we understand the Words in such a  
 “ Sense, they will be plain Tautology. *This*  
 “ *do ye. Do what? drink this.* Then the  
 “ Sense must be, *drink this, as oft as ye drink it*  
 “ *in Remembrance of me.*” But there is no  
 Occasion to understand *noies* to signify to offer  
 to avoid Tautology in this Command. *Christ* in  
 these Words gives his Disciples a Caution to be  
 careful, when they *eat Bread and drink Wine* in  
 pursuance of this his Command, *to eat and drink*  
*them in Remembrance of him*; to eat and drink  
 them agreeable to the End of the Institution, and  
 the Sense of them is clearly and plainly given by  
 our Author, p. 18. “ As often as ye shall meet  
 “ to *drink Wine*, professedly for this Purpose,  
 “ (that is, in Remembrance of me) take Care  
 “ that ye always do it, not as drinking at a com-  
 “ mon Meal, but in a religious Remembrance  
 “ of me.” And thus the Sense is very good  
 without understanding *noies* to signify to offer,  
 for which Sense of the Word there is not the  
 least Foundation. No, says Dr. Brett, this Para-  
 phrase does not remove the Tautology; the  
 plain Meaning of it being only this, *As often as*  
*ye meet professedly to drink Wine not as at a com-*  
*mon Meal, but in Remembrance of me, take care,*  
*that ye always drink it not as at a common Meal,*  
*but in Remembrance of me.* But in these Words  
 there is no Tautology, except to meet professedly  
 to drink Wine, not as at a common Meal, but in  
 Remembrance of *Christ*; and to drink Wine not  
 as at a common Meal, but in Remembrance of  
*Christ*, be the same, which they certainly are  
 not. For, if they are, then it is impossible for a  
 Person to receive the Lord's Supper without a due  
 Remembrance of *Christ*; without believing in

## 176 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Christ*, being heartily sorry for his past Transgressions of his Commands, and sincerely disposed to perform them for the future. For whoever does not thus believe, is sorry, and disposed, cannot be said to have a due Remembrance of *Christ*. And if it be impossible for any Person to receive the Lord's Supper without a due Remembrance of *Christ*, then it is impossible for any Person to receive it unworthily. For whoever comes to the Lord's Supper, does by the very Act of coming there *profess*, that he comes to eat and drink Wine not as at a common Meal, but in Remembrance of *Christ*; this is signified by every Person, who comes to receive the Lord's Supper, by his very Act of coming there; and to *profess* to do so he is understood by all, who behold him: and yet he may eat the Bread, and drink the Wine there unworthily and without a due Remembrance of *Christ*; he may be an Infidel, and not believe in *Christ* at all, and tho' he may not directly deny *Christ*, yet he may have transgressed his Commands, and not have repented of it so far, as to be sorry for it, and sincerely to design, and be disposed to obey his Will for the future; all this a Person may be guilty of, and yet meet with *Christians professedly* to eat Bread and drink Wine in a due Remembrance of *Christ*. For this he *professes* to do by the very Act of coming with *Christians* to eat Bread and drink Wine at the Lord's Supper, where the Bread and Wine are given, and designed to be eaten and drunk in a due Remembrance of *Christ*. Persons *meet professedly* to drink Wine, not as at a common Meal, but in Remembrance of *Christ*, when they come with other *Christians* to drink Wine at the Lord's Supper,

Supper, where Wine is given to be drunk in Remembrance of *Christ*, whether they do drink it in Remembrance of *Christ*, or not: But they do *really* and *actually* drink Wine, not as at a common Meal, but in Remembrance of *Christ*, when they do *actually* drink it in such a Remembrance of him, as he designed. And thus tho' the Word *ποιεῖτε* does not signify to *offer* in the Words of the Institution, the Command concerning the Cup is free from all Tautology, and the Sense of it good, as explained in the Paraphrase of our Author; or thus to the like Effect, Drink Wine, as you have just now drunk it in Remembrance of me, as oft as ye drink it in Consequence of this Command of mine to drink Wine in Remembrance of me; have then a particular Remembrance of me, who I am, what I have done and suffered for you, that so the Remembrance of it may be continued and fixed deep in your Minds, and the Thoughts of it may be fresh, and have their proper Influence upon you.

*The Sacrament of the Altar* makes the same Objection to this Paraphrase of our Author upon this Command, p. 26, where he also says, that *ποιεῖν* never signifies to *drink*, but either to *make*, or to *offer*. But from what hath been said it appears, that *ποιεῖν* may signify to *drink*, and that it does not always signify either to *make*, or to *offer*.

I shall now proceed to consider the Argument brought from the Authority of the Fathers to prove the Lord's Supper to be a material Sacrifice. The Fathers, Dr. Brett says, do often call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation*, or some Name equivalent; and the



178 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Doctor supposes, that the Fathers call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation*, because it was a material Sacrifice, and the Bread and Wine were therein offered as a Sacrifice to God. But if the Fathers did not call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation*, because it was a material Sacrifice, and because the Bread and Wine are therein offered as a Sacrifice to God; but for some other Reason, their calling the Lord's Supper by those Names is no Proof, that they believ'd the Lord's Supper to be a material Sacrifice, and that the Bread and Wine were to be offered therein as a Sacrifice to God, and that they ought to be so offered. And that the Fathers did call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation* for some other Reason, I think, will appear most probable from the following Considerations.

Had it been the Design of *Christ*, that the Lord's Supper should be a material Sacrifice, and that the Bread and Wine should be offered in Sacrifice to God therein, he would certainly have plainly and expressly said so in Scripture, and not have left it to be collected by such doubtful and uncertain Inferences, to say no worse of them, which the Advocates of that Opinion bring in support of it from those Texts of Scripture, which they imagine favour this Doctrine. Since then the Lord's Supper is no where in Scripture expressly said to be, or called a Sacrifice, nor the Bread and Wine said to be offered to God, nor commanded to be so, it is most reasonable to think, that *Christ* did not design the Lord's Supper to be a material Sacrifice, nor the Bread and Wine therein to be offered in Sacrifice to God. Moreover I have already considered the Texts of Scripture

Scripture brought to prove the Lord's Supper to be a material Sacrifice, and shewn them to be insufficient for that Purpose. Upon this Account; if any probable and natural Reason can be assigned, why the Fathers called the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation*; besides its being a material Sacrifice, it is most reasonable, and most for the Credit of the Fathers, to understand them to call it a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation* for that Reason; and not because it is a material Sacrifice, and the Bread and Wine are therein offered as a material Sacrifice to God. To do otherwise is to say, that the Fathers have asserted that, *viz.* That the Lord's Supper is a material Sacrifice, for which there is no Reason and Foundation in Scripture, and which, as far as can be judged from Scripture, it is most probable, is false. And I think it a very probable and natural Reason, why the Fathers called the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, because thereby was commemorated the grand Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross; and why they called it an *Offering* and *Oblation*, because the Bread and Wine were therein devoted to, and used in the Service of God, and eat and drunk in Obedience to his Command, and in the Manner prescribed by him. It is very natural to call that, which is done in Memory of any thing, by the Name of that, in Memory of which it is done; and to *offer* does not always signify to offer something in Sacrifice, but to devote and bring a Thing to be used in the Service of God, or to use a Thing in the Service of God according to his Command, and in the Manner prescribed by him: And then what is devoted to, and used in the Service of God, and in the Manner prescribed by him,

180 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

may be said to be *offered*, and be called an *Offering* or *Oblation*.

Thus in the First and Third Chapters of *Leviticus*, the Man who brought an Offering unto the Lord, is said to *offer* that which he brought; where to *offer* does not signify to *offer* it in Sacrifice, but only to bring and devote it to be used in the Service of God. So *Exod. xxiii. 18. Thou shalt not offer the Blood of my Sacrifice with leaven Bread*; and again, *xxxiv. 25. Where Sacrifice* signifies the Paschal Lamb, and to *offer* signifies not to offer the Lamb, or the Blood of it in Sacrifice, but to eat the Lamb with *unleaven Bread*, as God had commanded it to be eaten in the Feast of the Passover. That to *offer* here does not signify to offer the Lamb or the Blood of it in Sacrifice appears from hence; that the Words, *Thou shalt not offer the Blood of my Sacrifice with leaven Bread*, imply, that the Offering and the using or eating Bread were to be done together; but supposing the Paschal Lamb was a Sacrifice, and Part of it was offered upon the Altar, yet the Bread was not used or eaten, when the Lamb or Part of it was offered, but afterwards when they eat the Lamb, and also during the whole seven Days of the Feast. If it should be said, that Bread was used, when the Lamb was offered, because, as Mr. *Bowyer* says, p. 40. all Bloody Sacrifices had a Meat-Offering attending them, and that the Bread, which is here commanded not to be leaven, signifies the Meat-Offering, I answer, that, if the Bread here signifies the Meat-Offering, there would have been no Occasion for such a particular Command, that it should not be leavened; for all Meat-Offerings are in their Nature unleavened.

For



For thus it is commanded concerning them, *Levit. ii. 11. No Meat-offering, which ye shall bring unto the Lord, shall be made with Leaven: For ye shall burn no Leaven, nor any Honey, in any Offering of the Lord made by Fire.* So that it is much more probable, that the Bread here signifies the Bread, which they were to eat, when they feasted upon the Lamb, and during the whole seven Days of the Feast; concerning which Bread, that it should be unleavened, there is constantly a Command, when any Directions are given about the Passover. To offer the Blood of my Sacrifice therefore must signify here to eat the Paschal Lamb with unleavened Bread, as God had commanded it to be eaten, or to keep the whole Feast of the Passover according to his Command. And accordingly, to eat and drink the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, or to celebrate the Lord's Supper, according to the Command of *Christ*, may be said to be offering the Bread and Wine, and the Lord's Supper may be called an *Offering* or *Oblation* for that Reason. It is therefore most reasonable to understand the Fathers to call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering* or *Oblation*, not because it was a material Sacrifice; but because thereby was commemorated the grand Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross, and because the Bread and Wine were therein devoted to, and used in the Service of God, and eat and drank, in Obedience to his Command, and in the Manner prescribed by him.

And as it thus appears probable, that the Fathers did not call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation*, because it was a material Sacrifice, from the Consideration of the Matter

in general, without particularly examining in what Sense the Fathers did call it by those Names ; so is this confirmed by what Dr. *Waterland* says in his *Review* of the Doctrine of the *Eucharist* : It is confirmed, that they did not call the Lord's Supper a *Sacrifice*, *Offering*, or *Oblation*, because it was a material Sacrifice ; tho' the Reasons there given, why the Fathers called the Lord's Supper by those Names, are different from, tho' perhaps only additional to, those already assigned.

Now Dr. *Waterland*, than whom no one has more fully and diligently searched the Fathers, or was better capable of understanding them, says p. 34 of his *Review*, that the Lord's Supper was by the Fathers called an *Offering* or *Oblation* upon the Account of the Gifts, which the People always brought, when they came to receive the Lord's Supper ; which Gifts consisted partly of Alms to the Poor, to be distributed amongst the indigent Brethren, and partly of *Oblations*, properly so called, to the Church, to be bestowed either towards the due Performance of Divine Service, or towards the Advantage of the Ministers ; and because, whenever the People came to receive the Lord's Supper, they constantly brought Gifts, which were offered for these Purposes, and this *Offering* or *Oblation* always accompanied the receiving the Lord's Supper, therefore the whole Service of the Lord's Supper, or the *Eucharist*, came to be called the *Oblation*, and to administer or communicate, was to *offer*. And p. 48. he tells us, that the *Eucharist* was called a Sacrifice for the two first Centuries on Account of those Oblations just mentioned, which were always joined to the Reception of the Lord's Supper ; or on Account of the

the spiritual Sacrifices, which always went along with the Eucharistical Service, and which he more largely speaks of in Chap. xii. but that, by the Middle of the third Century, if not sooner, it began to be called a *Sacrifice* on account of the grand Sacrifice represented and commemorated in it; and that in After ages this became the most general Sense, in which the Eucharist was called a *Sacrifice*.

So that tho' the Fathers do call the Lord's Supper an *Offering* or *Oblation*, and a *Sacrifice*, yet it was not because the Bread and Wine were therein offered as a Sacrifice to God; but on the account of the Oblations of the People, which were constantly joined to the Reception of the Lord's Supper, and of the spiritual Sacrifices, which always went along with the Eucharistical Service, and on account of the grand Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross being represented and commemorated in the Lord's Supper, being represented and commemorated to and by Men, not to God; the Reasons brought to prove that *Remembrance* in the Words of the Institution respects God, the putting God in Mind, being above shewn to be insufficient for that Purpose. Therefore there is no Reason from the Authority of the Fathers to believe, that the Bread and Wine are in the Lord's Supper to be offered as a Sacrifice to God, or that the Lord's Supper is a *Sacrifice*, because they are therein so offered.

To this Dr. Brett objects, in his *Remarks* on Dr. *Waterland's Review*, p. 130. First, That if the Service of the Eucharist (which Service Dr. *Waterland*, in Chap. xii. says the Fathers meant by Sacrifice, when they called the Eucharist a Sacrifice, and in which Service he compre-



hends all those spiritual Sacrifices, which went along with the Eucharistical Service) if the Service of the Eucharist, says Dr. Brett, be the Sacrifice, and not the material Things of Bread and Wine, it is impossible there can be a material Sacrifice offered to God; because what is here said of the Eucharist, may in the same Manner be applied to all *material Sacrifices* whatsoever, tho' such as always go by the Name of *Sacrifices* in Scripture, viz. Not that the material Offering is a *Sacrifice* to God, for it goes entirely to the Use of Men, but the Service is what God accepts.

To which I answer, That it is true indeed, it may be applied to, or said of all material Offerings whatsoever, not that the material Offering is a *Sacrifice* to God, for it goes entirely to the Use of Man; but the Service is what God accepts: Or, to put the Argument in its proper Form, in all material Offerings the Service is what God accepts, and not the material Thing offered; for that goes entirely to the Use of Man, if no Part of it be consumed in the Act of Offering; therefore the Service, and not the material Offering, is a *Sacrifice* to God. This, I say, may indeed be applied to, and said, of all material Offerings whatsoever; but then it cannot be truly said of them, and therefore will not prove them not to be *Sacrifices* to God. For in Cases, where God has appointed some material Thing in general, or any particular material Thing, to be offered as a *Sacrifice* to himself, there, when a material Thing is offered to God in the Manner by him appointed, that material Thing is a *Sacrifice* to God, and is accepted by him in such a Manner as is suitable to his Nature, tho', if no Part of it be consumed in the Act of Offering, it afterwards go entirely to the Use

Use of Man, and tho' God also accepts the Service of the Offerer at the same Time. The material Offering is constituted a *Sacrifice* by its being appointed to be offered as a Sacrifice to God, and by its being offered in the Manner appointed by him, and is accepted by him as such, and he accepts also the Service of the Offerer as an Act of Obedience. The Act of Offering, and of bringing and devoting the material Thing to be offered, considered as an Act of Obedience, or of Honour and Worship towards God, in the Offerer, and him, who brings and devotes the material Thing to be offered, is a *Spiritual Sacrifice*; the material Thing considered as offered to God is a *material Sacrifice*. Material Things may be used in spiritual Sacrifices, and yet not be themselves offered as Sacrifices, when they are not appointed by God to be so offered, which Dr. Waterland apprehends to be the Case of the Eucharist: And material Things may be used together with a spiritual Sacrifice, and yet be themselves offered as a Sacrifice to God, when they are appointed by God to be so offered, which is the Case of all those material Sacrifices, which God hath at any Time appointed to be offered to himself. And therefore to say, that the Service of the Eucharist, and not the material Things of Bread and Wine, is the *Sacrifice*, does not prove that there never is, was, nor can be a material Sacrifice. To say that a material Offering, no Part of which is consumed in the Act of Offering, goes entirely to the Use of Man, and is not a Sacrifice to God, but the Service is what God accepts, is not sufficient to prove, that those material Offerings are not material Sacrifices to God, which he has appointed to

to be offered as Sacrifices to himself ; and yet to say, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist go entirely to the Use of Man, and that the Service is what God accepts, is sufficient to account for the Father's calling the Eucharist a *Sacrifice*, without intending, that the Bread and Wine are therein offered as a Sacrifice ; and to shew, that tho' they do call the Eucharist a *Sacrifice*, yet they did not call it so, because the Bread and Wine are offered as a *Sacrifice* to God, when God hath no where appointed them to be offered in Sacrifice to himself. The Bread and Wine may be used in the *spiritual Sacrifice* of the Eucharist in the Manner appointed by God, and yet not be offered in Sacrifice to him, as he hath not appointed them to be so offered ; a material Thing, which God hath appointed to be offered in Sacrifice to himself, may be so offered to him, together with a spiritual Sacrifice of the Offerer, and him, who brings and devotes the material Thing to be offered, consisting in the Act of Offering, and bringing and devoting that material Thing to be offered.

Secondly, Dr. Brett objects, That it is to no Purpose to plead, that, when the Fathers called the Eucharist a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation*, they meant the Service, and not the material Things of Bread and Wine ; because they do expressly give the Name of *Sacrifice* and *Oblation* to the material Things, and not to the Service.

To which it is replied, That it is no Proof, that the Bread and Wine were offered in Sacrifice to God, because they had the Name of *Sacrifice* and *Oblation* given to them, except they had those Names given to them, because they were offered in Sacrifice to God ; but this does not appear,



pear. On the contrary, as the Service of the Eucharist was called the *Oblation*, and to administer or communicate, was to *offer*, on account of the Oblations of the People, which were constantly joined to the Reception of the Lord's Supper, there can be no Doubt, but the Bread and Wine, being the Things which were administered or communicated in, were called the *Oblation*, and said to be *offered* on the same Account; and therefore had not the Name *Oblation* given to them, nor were said to be *offered*, because they were *offered* in Sacrifice to God. Again, as the Service of the Eucharist was called a *Sacrifice*, on account of the spiritual Sacrifices, which always went along with it, and of the grand Sacrifice's being represented and commemorated by it, to and by Men, so, doubtless, the Bread and Wine were called a *Sacrifice* upon the account of those spiritual Sacrifices, which always accompanied the eating and drinking them, and of the grand Sacrifices being represented and commemorated by them to and by Men\*. Again, as the Lord's Supper, and the Bread and Wine in it were called a *Sacrifice*, because the grand Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross was commemorated by them; so it is probable, they were called an *Oblation* and *Offering*, because the grand Oblation and Offering of *Christ* upon the Cross was commemorated by them.

To what Dr. *Waterland* observes, that the Eucharist was called an *Oblation* or *Offering* on account of the Oblations of the People, which were constantly joined to the Celebration of it, Mr. *Beeke* objects, in his *Eucharistical Sacrifice*,

\* See p. 179.

p. 11. " That those Oblations of the People  
 " were not an essential Part of the Eucharist, and  
 " it appears to him unaccountable, that the Eu-  
 " charist should so frequently take a Name from  
 " what was not essential to it." But I cannot  
 help thinking it very accountable, and very ra-  
 tional to imagine, that the Eucharist might take  
 a Name from that, which was constantly joined  
 with it, tho' it was not essential to it, and be fre-  
 quently called by that Name ; and I think, that  
 those Oblations being constantly joined to the  
 Celebration of the Eucharist, tho' they were not  
 essential to it, is a very probable and rational Ac-  
 count, why it was called an *Oblation* or *Offer-*  
*ing*.

And in this Sense are the Fathers every where  
 to be understood, where they speak of the Bread  
 and Wine *as offered* in the Lord's Supper, or of  
*Christ as offering* the Bread and Wine, or himself  
 at the Institution of it, *viz.* to mean thereby the  
 Performance of, or Celebration of the whole Ser-  
 vice. For when to administer, or to communi-  
 cate in the Eucharist, after it was instituted, came  
 to be called to *offer* the Bread and Wine, it is not  
 unlikely, that *Christ's instituting* the Eucharist  
 should be also sometimes called his *Offering* the  
 Bread and Wine ; and as the Bread and Wine  
 were the *Signs* and *Representations* of *Christ*, of  
 his Body and Blood, neither is it unlikely, that  
 his *instituting* the Eucharist should be called his  
*Offering* himself, or his Body and Blood ; that  
 is, that the Performing of the Service of the Eu-  
 charist at the Time he instituted it, should be  
 called his *Offering* of himself, or of his Body and  
 Blood.

And

And thus that Passage of St. Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. p. 155. is to be understood, from which it is so strongly pleaded, that *Christ* offered himself to God, when he instituted the Eucharist, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, and that he is to be so offered now, whenever the Eucharist is celebrated, appears to be of no Force to prove this. *Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus Sacerdos Dei Patris, et Sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui Commemorationem præcepit, utique ille Sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id, quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et Sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesiâ Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre, secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse.* If this Passage be translated according to the Manner of speaking at the present Time, those Words *et Sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit*, supposing they are meant of the Lord's Supper, must be rendered thus, and first appointed Bread and Wine to be the Signs and Representations of his Body and Blood, and gave them to his Disciples to eat and drink; and those Words, *et Sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesiâ Deo Patri*, must be rendered thus, and then does in the Church truly and compleatly set apart and appoint Bread and Wine to be the Signs and Representations of the Body and Blood of Christ, and gives them to the People to eat and drink; and those Words, *si sic incipiat offerre, secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse*, thus, if he begins in like Manner to set apart and appoint Bread and Wine to be the Signs and Representations of the Body and Blood of Christ, and to give them to the People to eat and drink, as he sees Christ to have set apart and appointed Bread and Wine



## 196 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Wine, to be the Signs and Representations of his Body and Blood, and to have given them to his Disciples to eat and drink; and then the Sense of this Passage is this: "If *Jesus Christ* our Lord and God, be the High Priest of God the Father, and first appointed Bread and *Wine* to be the Signs and Representations of his Body and Blood, and gave them to his Disciples to eat and drink, and commanded this to be done in Remembrance of himself; then that Priest truly acts in *Christ's* stead, who imitates what *Christ* did, and then does in the Church truly and compleatly set apart and appoint Bread and *Wine* to be the Signs and Representations of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, and gives them to the People to eat and drink, if he begins in like Manner to set apart and appoint Bread and *Wine* to be the Signs and Representations of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, and to give them to the People to eat and drink, as he sees *Christ* has set apart and appointed Bread and *Wine* to be the Signs and Representations of his Body and Blood, and to have given them to his Disciples to eat and drink." Or shorter thus, "If *Jesus Christ* our Lord and God be the High Priest of God the Father, and first administered the Eucharist of himself, or of his Body and Blood, and commanded this to be done in Remembrance of himself; then that Priest truly acts in *Christ's* stead, who imitates what *Christ* did, and does in the Church truly and compleatly administer the Eucharist, if he begin so to administer it, as he sees *Christ* to have administered it." For, as has been above shewn, to administer the Eucharist

rist was by the Fathers called to offer it, or to offer the Bread and Wine.

And according to this Sense is that other Passage of St. Cyprian to be understood, *In Sacerdote Melchisedech Sacrificii Dominici Sacramentum prefiguratum videmus, secundum quod Scriptura divina testatur et dicit, Et Melchisedech rex Salem protulit Panem et Vinum, fuit autem Sacerdos Dei summi, et benedixit Abraham; quod autem Melchisedech typum Christi portaret, declarat in Psalmis Spiritus Sanctus, ex personâ Patris ad Filium dicens, Tu es Sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech; qui Ordo utique hic est de Sacrificio illo veniens, et inde descendens, quod Melchisedech Sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod Panem et Vinum obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit. Nam quis magis Sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est, Panem et Vinum suum scilicet Corpus et Sanguinem? Et circa Abraham Benedictio illa precedens ad nostrum Populum pertinebat.* Epist. lxiii. This Passage, I say, is to be understood thus, “ In the Priest *Melchisedech*, we “ see the Sacrament of the *Lord's* Sacrifice pre- “ figured, according as the Divine Scripture testi- “ fies and says, *And Melchisedech, King of Salem, “ brought forth Bread and Wine, and he was “ Priest of the most high God, and he blessed A- “ braham*: And that *Melchisedech* was a Type of “ *Christ* the Holy Ghost declares in the *Psalms*, “ saying unto the Son in the Person of the Fa- “ ther, *Thou art a Priest for ever after the Or- “ der of Melchisedech*: The Order which is “ thence handed down to us concerns his Sacri- “ fice, that *Melchisedech* was Priest of the most “ High

192 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ High God, that he brought forth Bread and  
 “ Wine, and gave them to *Abraham* to eat and  
 “ drink, or administered Bread and Wine to *A-*  
 “ *bram*, that he blessed *Abraham*, For who is  
 “ more a Priest of the most High God, than our  
 “ Lord *Jesus Christ*, who administered the Eucharist  
 “ in Obedience, and agreeable to the Will of God the  
 “ Father, thereby offering a Sacrifice to him, and ad-  
 “ ministrated the same that *Melchisedec* had ministrated,  
 “ that is, Bread and Wine, which were his Body and  
 “ Blood, as they were the Signs and Represen-  
 “ tations of them? And that preceding Bene-  
 “ diction of *Abraham* belonged also to our Peo-  
 “ ple.” As the Fathers called administering the  
 Eucharist *Offering* Bread and Wine, and if they  
 thought *Melchisedec*’s bringing forth Bread and  
 Wine to *Abraham* to be a Type of the Eucha-  
 rist, so it is probable they called his bringing  
 forth Bread and Wine to be *offering* Bread and  
 Wine. As to what Dr. Brett says to prove that  
*Melchisedec* did properly offer the Bread and  
 Wine brought forth to *Abraham* as a material  
 Sacrifice to God, it is insignificant, and is suffi-  
 ciently answered by Mr. Wingfield, in his *Lord’s*  
*Supper not a Sacrifice*, p. 57.

Tho’ after all I cannot help thinking, that St.  
*Cyprian* is mistaken, when he says, that *Melchise-*  
*dec*’s bringing forth Bread and Wine to *Abra-*  
*ham* was a Prefiguration of the Lord’s Supper.  
 For he says the same of the Passages following,  
*viz. Prov. ix. 1, 2, 5. Gen. xlix. 11. and*  
*Isaiab lxiii. 2.* And yet I cannot imagine, that any  
 Person believes those Passages prefigure the  
 Lord’s Supper, or at all relate to it; and there is  
 no more Reason to believe, that the Passage re-  
 ferred to in the Words of St. *Cyprian* above cited,  
 relates



relates to the Lord's Supper, or that *Melchisedech's* bringing forth Bread and Wine to *Abraham*, was a *Prefiguration* of it, because *St. Cyprian* says it was.

And thus it appears, that the Fathers, when rightly understood, do not teach, that the Lord's Supper is a material Sacrifice, or that the Bread and Wine are therein offered in Sacrifice to God; and there is one of them, *viz. Justin Martyr*, who expressly teaches the contrary, and says, that there is no Sacrifice offered in the Lord's Supper, but that of *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings*; his Words are these, "Now that *Prayers* and " *Thanksgivings* made by them, who are worthy, are the only perfect and acceptable Sacrifices, I myself also say; for *Christians* have been instructed to offer *none other* in the Memorial of their Food both dry and liquid, in which also the Passion of the Son of God is commemorated." *Justin Dial.* p. 387. Now if there are *none other Sacrifices* offered in the Lord's Supper, but *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings* or *Praises*, the Bread and Wine cannot be offered in Sacrifice therein.

But to this Passage of *Justin Martyr*, which so plainly and expressly declares against the Bread and Wine's being offered in Sacrifice to God in the Lord's Supper, much more plainly and expressly against it, than any of the Fathers do any where declare for it, the Advocates for a *material Sacrifice* in the Eucharist have given an Answer, and, for his not replying to this Answer, *Dr. Brett* reproves *Dr. Waterland*. I imagine, *Dr. Waterland* omitted to reply to this Answer, because he thought it but of little Weight; however, since *Dr. Brett* in his *Remarks* has produced

duced it, p. 157. I shall take it into Consideration.

First, It is said, "That all Sacrifice is either  
 " Prayer or Praise, ——— and that all Sacrifices  
 " take their Name from their Use or End; so  
 " a Sacrifice for Sin is called *ἁμαρτία*, the Tres-  
 " pass-offering *πλημείλεια*, the Peace-offering  
 " *σωτήριον*, the Vow *ἑὺχ*, the Sacrifice of  
 " Thanksgiving *αἶνεσις* by the LXX, *ευχαριστία*  
 " by *Aquila*, the Free-will-offering *ἑμολογία*, or  
 " *αἰρεσις*, which Words literally signify *Sin*,  
 " *Trespass*, *Salvation*, *Prayer*, *Praise*, *Con-*  
 " *fession*, or *Choice*," all spiritual Things. From  
 whence it is insinuated, that, when *Justin* calls  
*Prayers* and *Praises* the only perfect Sacrifices  
 and acceptable to God, he means not *mental*  
*Prayers* and *Praises*; but some material Thing  
 offered to God.

To which I answer, that tho' all Sacrifices are  
 either Prayer or Praises, they being offered either  
 as Petitions for what we want, or as Acknowledg-  
 ments for what we have received, as Mr. *John-*  
*son* says, and all Sacrifices take their Name from  
 their Use and End; yet the Sacrifices here in-  
 stanced in by Mr. *Johnson*, do not take their  
 Name from their Use or End. For *Sin* is not  
 the Use or End of the Sin-offering, but the  
 Atonement of Sin; 2. *Trespass* is not the Use or  
 End of the Trespass-offering, but the Atonement  
 of the Trespass; 3. *Salvation*, or as  
 others understand *σωτήριον*, Happiness and Pro-  
 sperity, are not the Use or End of the Peace-  
 offering, but the Acknowledgment of them;  
 4. *A Vow* is not the End or Use of the Offering  
 called by that Name, but the Performance of it;  
 5. *Praise* is indeed the End of the Thankf-  
 giving-offering, *Levit. vii. 12.* 6. *Free-will* is  
 not the Use or End of the Free-will-offering, but

that, which it proceeds from. So that most of these Sacrifices take their Names not from the Use or End of them, but rather from that, which was the Occasion of them, or the particular Disposition of Mind, which they proceeded from. But this I note only by the Way; for, notwithstanding this, in these Sacrifices, upon account of some Circumstance attending them, the *material Thing* offered takes the Name of an *immaterial Thing*. Yet there is no Reason from thence to think, that, when *Justin* says *Prayer* and *Praises* are the only perfect *Sacrifices*, and acceptable to God, and that *Christians* have been instructed to offer *none other* in the Eucharist, he means not *mental Prayers* and *Praises*, but some *material Thing*. For tho' these Sacrifices are called by the Name of an *immaterial Thing*, yet it is not said, that in them the *immaterial Thing*, and that only, is offered, as *Justin* says, that *Prayers* and *Praises* only are offered in Sacrifice in the Eucharist. And therefore from those Sacrifices being called by the Name of an *immaterial Thing*, there is not the same Reason to conclude that no *material Thing* was offered in them, which there is to conclude, that no *material Thing* is offered in the Lord's Supper, because *Justin* says, that *Prayers* and *Praises* are the only *Sacrifices* offered therein. Moreover in all those Sacrifices here instanced in there is some material Thing appointed for a Sacrifice, and from the Occasion or End of it, or some Circumstance attending it, tho' the Occasion, End, or Circumstance be of an immaterial Nature, a Name is given to it: but in the Sacrifices of *Prayers* and *Praises*, mentioned in this Passage of *Justin*, there is no Appearance or Intimation of any ma-



terial Thing appointed for a Sacrifice. Tho' therefore, when Sacrifices, for which some material Thing is appointed to be offered, be called by Names, which literally signify only some immaterial Thing, as *Sin, Trespass, Salvation, Prayer, Praise, Confession, or Choice*, no Man can from thence conclude, that nothing was offered to God in these Sacrifices, but *Sin, Trespass, Salvation, Prayer, Praise, Confession, or Choice*; yet, when Sacrifices, for which no material Thing appears to be appointed to be offered, are called by Names, which literally signify only some immaterial Thing, as Prayers and Praises, we may justly conclude, that nothing was offered to God in those Sacrifices, but mental Prayers and Praises. If it should be said, that in this Passage of *Justin* the Bread and Wine are the material Things appointed to be offered; it is answered, that *Justin* does not here speak particularly of Prayers and Praises made at the Lord's Supper; but of Prayers and Praises in general, with regard to which Sacrifices of Prayers and Praises in general there can be no Pretence to say, that Bread and Wine are the material Things appointed to be offered in them; and such Sacrifices as these of Prayers and Praises in general are what *Justin* says, are alone offered in the Eucharist. Again, whether Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are appointed to be offered in Sacrifice is the Point in Question, and therefore it cannot be suggested, that they are appointed to be so offered, to support an Argument, which is to prove, that they are appointed to be offered in Sacrifice. And hence it appears, that Persons may have just Reason not to allow of any material Sacrifice in the *Christian Church*, when no material

material Thing appears to be appointed to be offered for a Sacrifice therein, because *Justin* calls the Sacrifices of *Christians* only Prayers and Praises; and yet they may not have Reason to assert, that no material Sacrifice was offered in the Temple of *Solomon*, when there were material Things plainly and expressly appointed to be offered for Sacrifices therein; because the material Things appointed for those Sacrifices were sometimes called Prayer or Praise, or by some other Name, which signifies an immaterial Thing.

2. The next Answer is, That in this Passage *Justin* does not affirm, that all Prayers and Praises, whensoever and wheresoever made, are the *most* perfect Sacrifices; but only Prayers and Praises offered up at the Eucharist in and by the Oblation of Bread and Wine, the Memorial of our Lord's Passion; and so does not say, that Prayers and Praises only are offered to God at the Eucharist, but that, when Prayers and Praises are offered up at the Eucharist together with the Offering of Bread and Wine, Prayer and Praises are then the *most* perfect Sacrifices. This I take to be the Sense and Force of the Argument in the second Answer. And this is endeavoured to be proved thus; that this antient Writer doth not say, that all Prayers and Praises are the *most* perfect Sacrifices; but only such, as are offered by worthy Men, that is, *Christians*, and at the Eucharist. In Answer to which I observe first, that the Word *most* is put in by Mr. *Johnson*, and is not in *Justin*. And next, what Reason is there to confine the Sense of *worthy Men* to *Christians* only? Those Words are plainly spoke in the general, and so as that they may extend to all worthy

198 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Men whatsoever; and it is certain, that there may be worthy Men, who are not *Christians*, viz. they, who, having never had sufficient Proof of the *Christian* Religion, sincerely endeavour to act according to that Portion of Knowledge, which they have. And then Prayers and Praises offered by such will be perfect Sacrifices, if Prayers and Praises offered by worthy Men are perfect Sacrifices. And if Prayers and Praises offered by Persons, who are not *Christians*, are perfect Sacrifices, then Prayers and Praises are perfect Sacrifices, tho' not offered up at the Eucharist; and therefore *Justin* does not say in this Passage, that only Prayers and Praises offered up at the Eucharist are perfect Sacrifices; but that Prayers and Praises, whensoever or wheresoever made by worthy Men, are perfect Sacrifices.

But that only Prayers and Praises offered by *Christians* at the Eucharist are perfect Sacrifices, is imported, Mr. *Johnson* says, in these Words, *These only we Christians have been instructed to offer in the Memorial of our Food.* But how these Words import, that to say, that *Prayers and Praises made by worthy Men are the only perfect Sacrifices*, is to say, that *only Prayers and Praises offered by Christians at the Eucharist are perfect Sacrifices*, I cannot perceive. To say, that *Christians have been instructed to offer none other Sacrifices in the Eucharist but Prayers and Praises*, cannot import, that to say, that *Prayers and Praises, made by worthy Men, are the only perfect Sacrifices*, is to say, that *only Prayers and Praises offered by Christians at the Eucharist are perfect Sacrifices*, except none but *Christians* can be worthy Men, which is not true; and except Prayers and Praises, made by worthy Men, are  
not



not perfect Sacrifices, if they be not made at the Eucharist, which is not true likewise.

Mr. *Johnson* goes on and says, "He does not give that Reason for it," that is, as I understand him, why *Christians* have been instructed to offer only the Sacrifices of Prayer and Praises in the Memorial of their Food, "which would best suit our Adversaries, viz. that it," that is, the Eucharist, expressed in this Passage by *by the Memorial of their Food, &c.* "is an immaterial Oblation," and therefore only immaterial Things were to be offered in it, "but the contrary, viz. that Prayers and Praises were offered in and by a material Memorial." But where is this Reason given? It is not contained in those Words, *In the Memorial of their Food both dry and liquid, in which also the Passion of the Son of God is commemorated.* For these Words are only a Name given to the Eucharist, and signify only in the Eucharist, and imply not at all, that Prayers and Praises offered therein were offered together with a material Memorial to God. And Mr. *Johnson* seems to be conscious of this. For he does not affirm, that *Justin* does absolutely say, that Prayers and Praises were offered in and by a material Memorial; but only, that he rather says this, than that the Eucharist is an immaterial Sacrifice. The Truth is, that *Justin* says neither the one nor the other, as a Reason, why *Christians* have been instructed to offer only the Sacrifices of Prayer and Praises in the Eucharist; but by his saying, that *Christians* have been instructed to offer only Prayers and Praises in the Eucharist, he plainly asserts, that no material Thing is offered to God therein, and therefore that it is only an immaterial Sacrifice.

Mr. *Johnson* goes on, and says, "For what  
 " can make these Devotions," that is, Devotions  
 at the Eucharist, "more prevalent than others,  
 " except it be that visible Memorial, that Me-  
 " morial, in which the Passion of our Lord is  
 " commemorated, as *Justin* speaks?" To which  
 Question I answer first, That *Justin* does not in  
 this Passage say, that Devotions at the Eucharist  
 are more prevalent than others; and so this  
 Question has nothing to do with this Passage.  
 Secondly, It may nevertheless be true, that De-  
 votions at the Eucharist are more prevalent than  
 others; and yet not be made so by any visible  
 material Memorial of the Passion of our Lord  
 being offered to God: but they may be made so  
 by their being offered up at the Eucharist with  
 more pious and devout Affections of the Heart.  
 The Belief, that *Christ* died for the Sins of Men,  
 is naturally fitted for, and ought, to beget in  
 them the most hearty and sincere Thanks and  
 Praises to God; and the most hearty and sincere  
 Purposes and Resolutions of obeying his Will.  
 And as at the Eucharist all worthy Receivers  
 have this Faith in a more particular and lively  
 Manner, so doubtless will they have those pious  
 and devout Affections of Heart in a more parti-  
 cular and lively Manner, which that Faith is na-  
 turally fitted to produce, and ought to beget in  
 them. For can it be imagined, they will ever  
 have these Affections in a more particular and  
 lively Manner, if they have them not so, when  
 they have that Faith in a more particular and  
 lively Manner, which is the only Foundation of,  
 and Motive to those Affections.

3. The third Answer is only an Inference from  
 the two preceding ones; and asserts, that from  
 them

them it is very evident, that *Justin*, in granting that Prayer and Praises, offered by worthy Men, are the most perfect Sacrifices, and that *Christians* offer none other in the Communion, means not vocal and mental Prayer and Praise, but some material Thing offered, as a Petition or Acknowledgment; and that those Prayers and Praises, offered by worthy Men in the Eucharist, are the most perfect and most acceptable, because they are offered together with that material Memorial, which *Christ* commanded to be offered. But from what I have said in reply to those two Answers it appears, that no such Meaning can be put upon *Justin's* Words; but that the plain Sense of them is, that none but immaterial Sacrifices, such as vocal and mental Prayers and Praises, are offered to God by *Christians* in the Eucharist.

4. The fourth Answer says, That it must be *Justin's* Meaning in this Passage, that the Bread and Wine are offered in the Eucharist, as well as Prayers and Praises, if we will suppose, that he discourses consistently; for in other Places he asserts, that Bread and Wine are offered in the Eucharist; and that in the Beginning of this very Paragraph he asserts a Thanksgiving Sacrifice of Bread and Wine. To which I reply, That from what has<sup>a</sup> been before said it appears, that *Justin* may assert, that Bread and Wine are offered in the Eucharist, and also assert a Thanksgiving Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, and yet discourse very consistently, tho' in this Place he says, that Prayers and Praises are the only Sacrifices offered to God in the Eucharist, and by

<sup>a</sup> See pag. 179.



consequence that Bread and Wine are not offered in Sacrifice to him therein. For *Justin* and the other Fathers do not say, that Bread and Wine are offered in the Eucharist, nor call them a Sacrifice, because they were offered in Sacrifice to God: but as the Service of the Eucharist was called the *Oblation*, and to administer or to communicate was to *offer*, on account of the *Oblations* of the People, which were constantly joined to the Reception of the Lord's Supper; so the Bread and Wine being the Things, which were administered and communicated in, were called the *Oblation*, and said to be *offered* also: and as the Service of the Eucharist was called a Sacrifice on account of the spiritual Sacrifices, which always went along with it, and of the grand Sacrifice being represented and commemorated by it to and by Men; so the Bread and Wine were called a Sacrifice on account of those spiritual Sacrifices, which always accompanied the worthy eating and drinking them, and of the grand Sacrifice being represented and commemorated by them.

5. The fifth Answer says, That *Justin* is here answering an evasive Cavil of the *Jews*; and that, tho' in this Answer, he allows Prayer and Praises, offered by worthy Men in the Eucharist, to be the best Sacrifices; he lets them know what makes them so, *viz.* the Memorial in and by which it is offered. But in my Reply to the second Answer I have shewn, that *Justin* does not assert in this Passage, that Prayers and Praises, offered by worthy Men in the Eucharist *only*, are the best Sacrifices; but Prayers and Praises offered in the general in any Time or Place; and likewise that he does not here assert, that Prayers and

and Praises are offered in the Eucharist in and by any Memorial, which is offered to God with them. Mr. *Johnson* goes on and says, That *Justin*, when left to his own Sentiments and Expression, speaks in quite another Manner, than now, when he is confuting a corrupt Gloss of the *Jews*. But it appears from what hath been said under the fourth Answer, that *Justin* does not at other Times say any Thing contrary to what he asserts in this Answer to the *Jews*, viz. that *Christians* have been instructed to offer none other Sacrifices in the Eucharist but Prayer and Praises; and therefore that no material Sacrifice is offered in the Eucharist. Again, Mr. *Johnson* says, That the Adversaries of the *Christian* Sacrifice, that is, of a material Sacrifice in the Eucharist, can never serve themselves or their Cause by *Justin's* Answer, 'till they can shew us on their Hypothesis, why Prayers and Praises made in the Memorial of *Christ's* Death, are the only perfect and acceptable Sacrifices. But from what I have already said it appears, that they have no Occasion to shew this; because this is asserted neither by *Justin* in this Answer, nor by the Adversaries of a material Sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Thus have I considered the Arguments, brought from the Fathers by the Advocates of a material Sacrifice in the Eucharist, in Favour of their Opinion; and it appears, that they apprehended the Fathers asserted, that the Bread and Wine were offered in Sacrifice to God in the Lord's Supper, thro' a Disregard to the Language and Manner of speaking at the Times, in which those Fathers wrote; and that the Fathers asserted no such Thing.

And

And this will farther appear by considering what the Fathers meant by a *Sacrifice*, as it is to be learnt from St. *Austin's* Definition of a *Sacrifice*, which follows; "A true *Sacrifice* is any Work done to keep up our League of Amity with God, referred to him as our Sovereign Good, in whom we may enjoy true Felicity." Now, according to this Definition of a *Sacrifice*, it is plain, that the Eucharist is a *Sacrifice*, tho' the Bread and Wine be not offered therein as a *material Sacrifice* to God. And as this is what the Fathers meant by a *Sacrifice*, it does not follow, that they believed or taught, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist were offered as a *material Sacrifice* to God, because they call the Eucharist a *Sacrifice*; for it may be a *Sacrifice* according to their Sense of a *Sacrifice*, and yet the Bread and Wine not be offered therein as a *material Sacrifice* to God. And as this is what the Fathers meant by a *Sacrifice*, so likewise it does not follow, that they believed or taught, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist were offered as a *material Sacrifice* to God, because they call them a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation*, or say, that they were offered to God. For as, by calling the Eucharist or the Service of it a *Sacrifice*, they meant any Work done to keep up our League of Amity with God, referred to him as our Sovereign Good; so, by calling the Bread and Wine therein a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation*, or saying they were offered to God, it is natural to understand them to call the Bread and Wine so, because they were the material Things used according to God's Direction in that Work done to keep up our League of Amity with God.

\* *Augustin. De Civ. Dei, Lib. x. cap. vi. p. 242.*



To this Definition of a Sacrifice Mr. Beeke in his *Eucharistical Sacrifice* objects\*, That if by it St. Austin means a proper *Sacrifice*, it will prove too much, viz. "That there never was any such Thing as a *material Sacrifice*; for what if some Part of the *material Thing* was burnt, lost, wasted, or consumed? yet it is not the Matter, but the Service, the good Work, the Duty performed, that is properly the Sacrifice, according to the Definition of St. Austin."

But this Objection does not at all weaken the Force of the Argument, drawn from this Definition of a Sacrifice, to prove, that the Fathers did not teach, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist were offered as a *material Sacrifice* to God. For let the Consequence of this Definition be what it will, yet, if this be what the Fathers meant by a *Sacrifice*, it does not follow, from their calling the Eucharist a *Sacrifice*, or the Bread and Wine therein a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation*, or saying that they were offered to God, that they believed, or taught the Eucharist to be a *Sacrifice* as the Bread and Wine were therein offered as a *material Sacrifice* to God.

But this Objection to St. Austin's Definition of a Sacrifice may be easily removed. For tho' a *Sacrifice* in general be any Work done to keep up our League of Amity with God, referred to him as our Sovereign Good, and any Work so done constitutes a *Sacrifice*, tho' no *material Thing* be offered in *Sacrifice*, and in that Case the Work only is the *Sacrifice*; yet a particular Sort of *Sacrifice* may be both a Work so done, and a *material Thing* offered to God, and both the Work and

206 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the *material Thing* constitute that particular Sort of *Sacrifice*, and in that Case both the *Work* and the *material Thing* are a *Sacrifice*. A *material Thing* may be used in any *Work* done to keep up our League of Amity with God, and referred to him as our Sovereign Good, and yet not be a *Sacrifice*, but the *Work* only be the *Sacrifice*. But when God hath appointed any *material Thing* to be offered in *Sacrifice* to himself, that *material Thing* is a *Sacrifice*, as well as the *Work* of Offering it<sup>a</sup>.

And now did the Fathers as plainly teach, that the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Eucharist were to be offered in *Sacrifice* to God, as our Adversaries contend they do, and which I have shewn they do not; yet, after all, the Testimony of the Fathers must yield to the plain Sense of Scripture, which appears to be, that the *Bread* and *Wine* are not to be offered in *Sacrifice* to God. This is more plainly the Sense of Scripture concerning the Lord's Supper, than the contrary is the Sense of the most early Fathers. And that there is not a plain and express Command in Scripture to offer the *Bread* and *Wine* in *Sacrifice* to God, is to me, I confess, a stronger Proof, that they are not to be so offered, than the united Testimony of all the Fathers would be, that they are. The only Place of Scripture, where our Adversaries pretend there is an express Command to offer the *Bread* and *Wine*, is the Words of the Institution by the Word *πρόσω*, which, they say, signifies to *offer*. But I have shewn the Reasons given to prove *πρόσω* to signify to *offer* to be merely trifling, and entirely without Foundation. A necessary Consequence of maintaining, that the

<sup>a</sup> See p. 185.

Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are to be offered to God, as a *material Sacrifice*, is that the Lord's Supper is not a necessary Duty: For if the Bread and Wine are to be offered as a *material Sacrifice* to God, then is the Offering them as a *material Sacrifice* an essential Part of the Lord's Supper. And then, if it be not necessary to offer the Bread and Wine as a *material Sacrifice* to God in the Lord's Supper, it is not necessary to perform the Lord's Supper at all. For that is not necessary to be done, of which an essential Part is not necessary to be done. But it is not necessary to offer the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper as a *material Sacrifice* to God. For it is not plainly revealed or taught in Scripture, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper are to be offered as a *material Sacrifice* to God. And it is a Maxim amongst Protestants, that *nothing is necessary to be believed*, nor by Consequence to be done, *but what is plainly revealed*, or taught in Scripture. See Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation*. Chap. ii. § 104.

Dr. Brett says, " He shall only observe farther, that our Church shews, that she understands the Word *Do this* to signify *offer this*, and therefore orders the *Bread and Wine* not to be placed on the *Lord's Table* by any other than the *Priest*, and requires him to place them there as *Oblations*; for at the Time that she restored that old Rubrick, which orders the *Priest to place the Bread and Wine upon the Table*, she also ordered him, at the beginning of the Prayer immediately following, *to beseech God to accept our Oblations*. Which Word *Oblations* being not in that Prayer (but the Word *Alms* only) before the Restoration

" of



208 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ of that Rubrick, shews that the Church by  
 “ adding that Word to the Word *Alms*, which  
 “ was before in the Prayer, at the very Time  
 “ that she restored that Rubrick, intended the  
 “ Priest should solemnly *offer* them there, and  
 “ esteemed the *Priest's placing* them there to be  
 “ the making them *Oblations*.”

But if the Church by the Word *Oblations* added to that Prayer does not mean the Bread and Wine at all, it will not follow, that, because the Church added the Word *Oblations* at the Time that she restored that Rubrick, which orders the Priest to *place the Bread and Wine upon the Table*, by the Word *Oblations* added to that Prayer she intended to signify the Bread and Wine *offered* and *made Oblations* by the Priest by *his placing them upon the Table*; nor that she intended the Priest should solemnly *offer* them there by *his placing them upon the Table*; nor that it is the Sense of the Church, that the Priest's *placing the Bread and Wine upon the Table*, is the *Offering* of them. But the Church, by the Word *Oblations*, doth not mean the *Bread and Wine*, but the *other Devotions of the People*, mentioned in the Rubrick before the Prayer for *Christ's Church Militant*. For before the last Review of the Liturgy, as Mr. *Wheatly* observes in his *Discourse upon the Common Prayer*, p. 284. (tho' indeed he afterwards says, that *Oblations* signifies the Bread and Wine) “ There was only mention  
 “ made of *the Devotions of the People* in that  
 “ Rubrick, by which *Alms for the Poor* were  
 “ then meant, as appears from that *Devotion of*  
 “ *the People's* being then ordered to be *put into*  
 “ *the poor Man's Box*. But at the last Review  
 “ there was in the same Rubrick a Distinction  
 “ made

“ made between what was offered by the People; and Part of it called *Alms for the Poor*, and Part called *the other Devotions of the People*.” The Words, *Alms for the Poor*, were added to the Rubrick at the last Review, at the Time when the Word *Oblations* was added to the following Prayer; and by *Alms for the Poor*, is undoubtedly meant all, which is given for their Relief, and, to signify them, the Word *Alms* in the following Prayer is plainly intended; by the *other Devotions of the People* is meant something distinct from the said *Alms*, and, to signify them, the Word *Oblations*, added to the following Prayer, is plainly intended. As before the last Review the Word *Alms*, in the Prayer for the Church Militant, referred to, and signified *the Devotion of the People* mentioned in the foregoing Rubrick, which Word *Devotion* comprehended then all the *Oblations* made by the People; and as at the last Review there was a Distinction made between the *Oblations* of the People in this Rubrick, and they were called by two different Names; Part by that of *Alms for the Poor*, and Part by that of *the other Devotions of the People*, and the Word *Oblations* was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant at the same Time, is it not most reasonable to think, that the Word *Oblations* was added in the Prayer upon Account of the Distinction made in the Rubrick? That as the Offerings of the People were now distinguished into two Parts, so, instead of one Word, viz. only *Alms*, before used to signify these Offerings, two Words, viz. *Alms* and *Oblations*, were put into the Prayer to signify these two different Parts; and that the Word *Alms* was intended to signify what was properly so called,

210 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*viz.* what was given for the Relief of the Poor, and the Word *Oblations* was intended to signify the *other Devotions of the People*, *viz.* what was given for some other Use. If it should be asked, What these *other Devotions of the People* were? it is answered, They were what was given for the Clergy; which Sort of Offerings were formerly made, and by this Rubrick it appears to be the Sense of the Church, that they should be still. That the Word *Oblations* was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant at the same Time, that the Rubrick was restored, which orders the Priest to *place the Bread and Wine upon the Table*, is no Reason, that the Word *Oblations* signifies the *Bread and Wine*, except there was nothing else, which it could possibly signify; but there is something else, which it plainly signifies. *The Sacrament of the Altar* likewise makes use of this Argument to prove, that the Church of *England* requires the Bread and Wine to be offered in Sacrifice to God, p. 67.

Thus have I considered the Arguments, brought to prove the Lord's Supper, to be a material Sacrifice, and that the Bread and Wine are therein offered in Sacrifice to God, and shewn them to be insufficient to prove this. I shall make one Observation or two before I leave this Part of the Controversy.

First, Supposing the Lord's Supper was a material Sacrifice, and the Bread and Wine were offered to God in Sacrifice, as Memorials to him of the Sacrifice of *Christ*, it does not from thence follow, that the Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Virtue and Efficacy, so as to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by any Virtue annexed



to them, and at and by the very Act of eating and drinking them. The Bread and Wine do not appear to be more the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Virtue and Efficacy, by their being offered in Sacrifice to God as Memorials of the Sacrifice of *Christ*, than if they were not offered as such.

Secondly, The Advocates for a material Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, when they declare by what Act the Bread and Wine are to be offered in Sacrifice to God, what is to be done, and by what Act the Lord's Supper becomes a material Sacrifice, say it is by the Priest's *placing the Bread and Wine upon the Communion Table* before the Consecration. See Dr. Brett's *Remarks on Dr. Waterland's Review*, p. 118. But this is to make the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice purely of their own Invention; there being no Foundation for the Necessity of this Act in what *Christ* did, when he instituted the Eucharist. For it appears by the Account of the Institution given in the New Testament, that *Christ* did not place the Bread and Wine upon the Table himself; but that he took them after they had been placed there by others, and gave Thanks, or blessed, and called them his Body and Blood, and gave them to his Disciples to eat and drink, and commanded them to eat and drink them in Remembrance of himself. As therefore the Priest, in order duly to celebrate the Eucharist, must do what *Christ* did, when he instituted it, as these Gentlemen contend, so it cannot be necessary for him to do more; and then for him to *place the Bread and Wine upon the Communion Table* before the Consecration cannot be necessary towards the due Celebration of the Eucharist; since it ap-

## 212 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

pears, that *Christ* did not place them upon the Table, when he instituted it; and therefore it is no necessary Part of the Lord's Supper for the Bread and Wine to be offered to God by the Priest's *placing them upon the Table*, nor is the Lord's Supper to become a Sacrifice by that Act.

XI. *Christians*, meeting together for religious Worship; and eating *Bread* and drinking *Wine* in Remembrance of *Christ's Body* and *Blood*, and in honour to him; do hereby publicly acknowledge him to be their Master, and themselves to be his Disciples: and by doing this in an Assembly, own themselves, with all other *Christians*, to be one *Body* or Society, under him the Head; and consequently profess themselves to be under his Government and Influence; and to have Communion or Fellowship with him, as *Head*, and with all their Christian Brethren, as *Fellow-members* of that same *Body* of which he is the *Head*.

To this Proposition nothing particular is objected, it being an Inference from that Passage of Scripture, 1 Cor. x. 16, &c. or if any Thing be objected to it, it is where that Passage is considered by the Adversaries of our Author, and is there answered.

Our Author proceeds next to another Passage of Scripture, which is, 1 Cor. xi. v 20, — 34.

Ver. 20. *When you come together into one Place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper.*

21. *For in eating every one taketh before other his own Supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken.*

22, *What? Have ye not Houses to eat and to drink*

drink in? or despise ye the Church of God and shame them, that have not? What shall I say unto you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.

Afterwards follows an Account of the Original Institution of the Lord's Supper, in *ſ* 23, 24, 25; then the Apostle argues from this Institution;

26. *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death 'till he come.*

27. *Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord UNWORTHILY, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.*

28. *But let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup.*

29. *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.*

30. *For this Cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.*

31. *For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.*

32. *But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World.*

33. *Wherefore, my Brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another.*

34. *And if any Man hunger, let him eat at home.*

Our Author's Paraphrase upon this Passage I shall set down in Dr. Warren's Words, only adding in one or two Places a few Words, which the Doctor has omitted.

" When you come together to eat and drink  
" in Remembrance of your Master, and behave



214 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ yourselves indecently, that is not to eat the  
 “ *Lord's Supper*, as it ought to be eaten. For  
 “ many of you behave yourselves as eating your  
 “ own Suppers to indulge your Appetites;  
 “ they, who are able to provide plentifully, eat-  
 “ ing at that Feast, to which you join the Lord's  
 “ Supper, without waiting for their poor Bre-  
 “ thren; and so one is hungry, and another  
 “ feasts beyond due Bounds. Have you not  
 “ Houses for your ordinary eating and drinking?  
 “ Or have ye no Sense, that ye come together  
 “ for the religious Purposes of eating and drink-  
 “ ing in Remembrance of your Master? Do ye  
 “ thus despise the Church of God, and shame  
 “ your poor Brethren, by a Behaviour, that insults  
 “ their Hunger,” our Author adds, *and Po-*  
 “ *verty?* — “ I cannot praise you for this,  
 “ On the contrary I condemn you, as acting in-  
 “ consistently with the *Original Institution* of  
 “ this Holy Rite. An Account of which I shall  
 “ now lay before you.” After the Apostle had  
 done this, says the Doctor, in  $\S$  23, 24, 25,  
 you say he argues from the Institution in this  
 Manner. — “ It is plain from the Institution,  
 “ that the Design of your meeting to eat THIS  
 “ Bread, and drink THIS Wine, is for the seri-  
 “ ous Purpose of shewing forth,” our Author  
 adds, *or keeping up the Remembrance of*, “ the  
 “ Death of *Christ* until he shall return in Glory.  
 “ Hence it follows, that every one, who, instead  
 “ of this, behaves himself as at a common Meal,  
 “ even without observing the Rules of Tem-  
 “ perance, is guilty of an Indignity against the  
 “ *Body and Blood of Christ*. On the contrary  
 “ let every one examine himself,” our Author  
 adds, *by considering the original Institution of this*  
*Rite*

*Rite* — “ or approve himself to his own  
 “ Conscience, as regarding the Design of the  
 “ Lord's Supper, and let him eat and drink so,  
 “ or in such a Manner as becomes that Design.  
 “ For if he performs this Duty in a Manner  
 “ unworthy of the Institution, not considering  
 “ the Bread as the Memorial of *Christ's* Body,  
 “ nor making a sufficient Difference between this  
 “ Bread, and an intemperate Meal,” — Our Au-  
 “ thor's Words are, *and a common Meal, even in-*  
*temperately taken,* — “ he is guilty of a great  
 “ Offence, and is liable to God's just Displea-  
 “ sure. This you may yourselves see from the  
 “ Effects of this Intemperance,” our Author  
 “ adds, *and the Tokens of God's Displeasure now*  
*amongst you.* — “ For you have impaired  
 “ the Health of your Bodies. Sicknefs, and  
 “ even Death are come amongst you.” Our  
 “ Author adds, *by the righteous Providence of God.*  
 — “ But if we would call ourselves to an  
 “ Account, and amend what is evil in us, we  
 “ should not be thus punished by God here, and  
 “ should not be finally condemned with the  
 “ World. Wherefore, my Brethen, when you  
 “ are to meet together at the Lord's Table, wait  
 “ for one another, 'till a good Number be as-  
 “ sembled, and then perform this religious Rite  
 “ with all Decency. But if any of you propose  
 “ to eat to satisfy Hunger, do it at home, this is  
 “ not the Place for it.”

After the Doctor has thus represented our Au-  
 “ thor's Paraphrase, he says, “ Now as easy and  
 “ natural at this *Paraphrase* may seem to be, and  
 “ with how much Assurance soever you may  
 “ give it for a just Representation of the Apostle's  
 “ Sense; I think, if all the Errors of it of every

216 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ Kind are numbered, they will not fall much  
“ short of the Number of Sentences in it.”

A very handsome Compliment this upon our Author indeed, and as he appears to be a very civil Gentleman, I doubt not but he is willing to return it, when he has such good Reason to do, and may so justly say of the Doctor's Answer to this Paraphrase, *That if all the Errors in it of every Kind are numbered, they will not fall much short of the Number of Sentences in it.*

The Doctor objects first to our Author's Paraphrase, “ That without any Manner of Ground  
“ or Probability, he supposes the *Corinthians* to  
“ be charged here by the Apostle as ignorant of  
“ the very Design of their coming together, even  
“ so as not to consider that the *Lord's Supper* differed from a common Meal; and that he repeated to them the Words of the *Institution*,  
“ to remind them of the Nature and Design of  
“ it.”

If by the *Corinthians* being “ ignorant of the  
“ the very Design of their coming together, even  
“ so as not to consider, that the *Lord's Supper*  
“ differed from a common Meal,” the Doctor means, that the *Corinthians* were both ignorant of the Design of their coming together, and also did not consider that the *Lord's Supper* differed from a common Meal, his Assertion is not true, “ That our Author supposes the Apostle to  
“ charge the *Corinthians* as ignorant of the very  
“ Design of their coming together.” For he does not suppose, that the Apostle charges them as ignorant of this, nor does the Manner in which he represents the Apostle to argue in this Passage, require this Supposition, but only the Supposition, that they did not *duly consider* the  
Design



Design of their coming together, and that the Lord's Supper differed from a common Meal. If the Doctor means only; That they did not consider this, there could be no Occasion for him to put in the Word *ignorant*, but only to misrepresent our Author's Meaning, and to mislead his Reader.

And as the Doctor appears either to have erred, or to have dealt unfairly in what he asserts in the first Part of his Objection; so is that also false, which he asserts in the latter Part, *viz.* "That without any Manner of Ground or Probability, our Author supposes the Apostle repeated to them the Words of the Institution, to remind them of the true Nature and End of the Lord's Supper." This our Author does suppose; but he is so far from doing it without any Ground or Probability, that it is not only probable, but certain, that the Apostle did repeat to them the Words of the Institution, to remind them of the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper. For if the Apostle did not repeat the Words of the Institution to them for this Purpose, there can be no Reason given why he did repeat them; or, if there was any other End to be served by repeating them, to remind them of the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper must be the *first* and *primary* End and Purpose of it, that, by their being thereby put in Mind of, and made to consider the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, they might be led to the Knowledge and Sense of what the Apostle intended here to teach them. And it appears from the 26<sup>th</sup> Ver. that the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, of which he intended to remind them by repeating the Words of the Institution,

tution, was, that it was to eat Bread and drink Wine to *shew forth*, or keep up the Remembrance of, *the Lord's Death* in this particular Manner, until he shall return in Glory. And if the Apostle did repeat the Words of the Institution to remind the *Corinthians* of the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, it plainly shews, and is a sufficient Ground for our Author to suppose, that tho' they knew it, yet they were either forgetful or inconsiderate of the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, and of the Design of their coming together, when they came together to partake of it.

The Doctor does not offer to give any Reason, why there is no Ground or Probability to suppose, that St. Paul repeated the Words of the Institution to remind the *Corinthians* of the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper; but he does give some, why there is no Ground or Probability to suppose, that the Apostle here charges the *Corinthians*, as not duly considering the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, and that it differed from a common Meal; and these I shall consider.

His first Reason is, " That it is not possible, that Persons so fully instructed in all the Mysteries of the *Christian* Religion, as the *Corinthians* were; and of whom St. Paul himself says, that they *were enriched by God, in all Utterance, and in all Knowledge, so that they came behind in no Gift*; and who frequently met together to eat the Lord's Supper, should be so destitute of the Knowledge of the first Elements of *Christianity*, as not to apprehend the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, and the Difference of it from

" a com-

“ a common Meal ; and as not ever to carry in  
“ their Minds, or duly consider this.”

To which I answer, That it is not supposed, that the *Corinthians* did not apprehend, or were ignorant of, the true Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper, and the Difference of it from a common Meal ; but only, that they had not this always in their Minds, or did not duly consider it. And that it is possible for Persons not always to have in their Minds, and actually think of, or duly consider that, which they know, and have an habitual Knowledge of, so as to regulate their Actions by it, is certain, and wants no other Proof than daily Experience. And tho' the *Corinthians* frequently met together to eat the Lord's Supper ; yet this does not render it at all more impossible for them to be so forgetful and inconsiderate of the Nature and Design of it, tho' they knew its Nature and Design, as not to regulate their Behaviour in partaking of it by that Knowledge.

The Doctor goes on, “ What farther shews  
“ the Grossness of this Supposition is, that these  
“ very Persons, whom you suppose so very stupid, were honoured in the foregoing Chapter  
“ with the Title of *wise Men*, and were applied  
“ to as Judges of Reason and Argument, and  
“ what is still a great deal more to the present  
“ Purpose, were applied to as Judges of an Argument, one Member of which was the very  
“ Point, of which they are by you supposed to  
“ be ignorant.” But here I must tell the Doctor again, that our Author does not suppose the *Corinthians* were ignorant of the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper ; but only, that they did not duly consider it. And wise Men and  
Judges



220 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Judges of Reason and Argument may not always duly consider of that, of which they are not ignorant, nor incompetent Judges. And thus is all the Absurdity and Difficulty, which the Doctor imagined attended our Author's Supposition, vanished, and he appears to suppose no more, than what happens every Day, and what is plainly implied in St. *Paul's* repeating in this Passage the Words of the Institution to remind them of the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, says the Doctor, " We have, very  
 " unfortunately for you, our Apostle's own  
 " Words, and express Declaration against it,  
 " — that is, against this, that the *Corinthians*  
 " did not duly consider the Nature and Design of  
 " the Lord's Supper, — " and that too in this  
 " very Chapter. For at the second Verse he  
 " says, *Now I praise you, Brethren, that you re-*  
 " *member me in all Things, and keep, hold fast,*  
 " *firmly retain, the Ordinances, as, just as, I*  
 " *delivered them unto you.* And that it appears  
 " from the 23<sup>d</sup> Ver. that one of the Ordinances,  
 " of which the Apostle here speaks, was that  
 " concerning the Participation of the Lord's  
 " Supper in Remembrance of *Christ*. And  
 " that it is not possible, that he should praise  
 " them at the 2<sup>d</sup> Ver. for retaining and holding  
 " fast the *Ordinances* as he had delivered them,  
 " and should moreover say at the 23<sup>d</sup> Ver. that  
 " one of these Ordinances was that concerning  
 " the Manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper,  
 " and yet should dispraise them at the 17<sup>th</sup> Ver.  
 " for having so far forgotten, what he had thus  
 " *delivered unto them*, or so little attended to it,  
 " as to need a Repetition of the Words of the In-  
 " stitution to remind them, how the Ordinance  
 " was

“ was to be performed. That the Apostle could  
 “ not do this with any Manner of Consistency,  
 “ That the very Supposition of it is a manifest  
 “ Charge upon him of such a Degree of Infir-  
 “ mity and Forgetfulness, as would destroy the  
 “ Authority of all he says upon this Occa-  
 “ sion.”

In Answer to which I ask, does the Apostle in this Passage blame or dispraise the *Corinthians* for any Faults at their partaking of the Lord's Supper, by being guilty of which they partook of it in an improper Manner; or not? If he does not; then this Passage has nothing to do with the Lord's Supper, so far, as that the Examination mentioned in it is not enjoined to the *Corinthians*, that they might thereby avoid those Faults, by being guilty of which in partaking of the Lord's Supper, they partook of it in an improper Manner. For they are not supposed by the Apostle to be guilty of any Faults in partaking of the Lord's Supper, by which they partook of it in an improper Manner; since he blames or dispraises them for no Faults, by which they did partake of the Lord's Supper in an improper Manner. And the Consequence of this is, that the Examination mentioned in this Passage was not enjoined to, nor to be practiced by the *Corinthians*, in order to prepare them to receive the Lord's Supper worthily, and by Consequence is not enjoined to, not to be practiced by any succeeding *Christians* for that Purpose.

But if the Apostle in this Passage does blame, or dispraise the *Corinthians* for being guilty of such Faults in partaking of the Lord's Supper, whereby they partook of it in an improper Manner; then he dispraises them for having so far forgotten

222 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

forgotten the *Ordinance* he delivered unto them concerning the Participation of the Lord's Supper, or so little attended to it, as to need a Repetition of that *Ordinance*, viz. The Words of the Institution, to remind them how the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper was to be performed. For if they had not been so forgetful of the Ordinance, he had delivered unto them concerning the Participation of the Lord's Supper, nor had so little attended to it, as to need a Repetition of that *Ordinance* to remind them how the Lord's Supper was to be performed, they would not have been guilty of any Fault in partaking of the Lord's Supper, whereby they partook of it in an improper Manner. And thus the Apostle does appear to dispraise them, *1* 17. for not retaining and holding fast that *Ordinance*, for their retaining and holding fast which he praises them, *1* 2. By doing which the Doctor, says, he is guilty of Inconsistency, and such a Degree of Infirmary and Forgetfulness, as destroys the Authority of all he says upon the Occasion. And yet, according to what the Doctor asserts here, he must charge the Apostle with this Inconsistency, Infirmary, and Forgetfulness; or else acknowledge, that this Passage has nothing to do with the Lord's Supper, as to the present Point in Question. And now I have brought the Doctor into as bad a Condition, as he thought he had our Author just now p. 19. and, was I as ill natured as he, might in the same Manner leave him in it, and cry out, *Get rid of this Difficulty in such a Manner, as you like best.* However, I shall tell him how he may get rid of it; and that is by so interpreting the second Verse, as to clear the Apostle of this Inconsistency, Infirmary, and



and Forgetfulness, as it very easily may be thus. Now I praise you, Brethren, that you remember me in all Things, and keep all the other Ordinances, as I delivered them unto you, except those, your Transgression of which I am now going to tell you of, and correct. And it is manifest, that, if the Faults, for which the Apostle blames the *Corinthians*, and which he endeavours to correct in this Chapter, were Transgressions of Ordinances, which he had before delivered to them, he must intend to except these Ordinances out of them, for their keeping and obeying which he praises them, & 2. And thus it appears, that Dr. Warren interprets, & 2. wrong in interpreting it to declare against what our Author supposes, viz. That the *Corinthians* did not duly consider the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, Dr. Warren objects to our Author's Paraphrase, " that without Ground he supposes, " that great Part of the Guilt of the *Corinthians* " consisted in joining the Lord's Supper to a " Feast, at which Feast they behaved themselves " disorderly, and eat and drunk with Intemperance and Excess." But this our Author does not suppose; but that their great Guilt consisted in eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper, which was joined to, and followed those Feasts, only to satisfy and indulge their own Appetites, and to a Degree of Excess; and not like Persons meeting to eat Bread and drink Wine, as the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Remembrance of him, which was the Nature and Design of the Lord's Supper; and that their partaking of the Lord's Supper in this unworthy Manner, was occasioned by their eating and drinking

## 224. *A Defence of the Plain Account*

drinking with Intemperance and Excess at their Feasts of Charity. That as in their Feasts of Charity they eat and drunk only to satisfy and indulge their Appetites, and with Intemperance and Excess, and were so intent upon and eager after this, as not to regard the End of these Feasts, nor tarry for their poor Brethren, who had nothing to bring, that they might partake of what the Rich had brought plentifully; and so all, who assembled at these Meetings, partaking in common of what was brought, their mutual Love for each other might be shewn and preserved; by which Means their Thoughts were disordered and discomposed in such a Manner, that afterwards they could not partake of the Lord's Supper in a proper Manner: But, as if it was only the Continuation of a foregoing Entertainment, they eat and drunk only to satisfy their Appetites as at their common Meals; regarded no other End; considered not the Bread and Wine as Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, nor eat and drunk them in Remembrance of him, and so did not discern the Lord's Body. And whereas the Doctor contends very earnestly, that μεθύει here does not necessarily signify to be *drunken*, but only to have drunk to a Degree of Chearfulness and Fulness, and that our Author injures the *Corinthians*, to charge them with being Drunk either at their Feasts of Charity or at the Lord's Supper; in answer to it I say, that whether μεθύει here signifies to be *drunken*, or only to have drunk to a Degree of Chearfulness and Fulness, it does not affect our Author's Paraphrase, so as to alter the main Sense of it, viz. That the *Corinthians* eat and drunk in the Lord's Supper only to satisfy their Appetites

tites, as at a common Meal, and not in a serious and a religious Remembrance of *Christ*. For they might do this tho' they were not drunk thereat, but only eat and drank to a Degree of Chearfulness and Fulness. And therefore I shall not enter into the particular Dispute what the true Sense of *μεθύει* here is. What the Doctor says in support of his Interpretation of *μεθύει* here is only, that *μεθύει* does sometimes signify only to drink to a Degree of Chearfulness and Fulness. But tho' it does sometimes signify no more; yet, as its most usual Sense is to *drink to Excess*, it is most probable, that the Apostle uses it here in that Sense. And the Opposition here made between *μεθύει* and *πεινᾷ* is so far from being an Argument in Favour of the Doctor, that it is the direct contrary. For as one imports a Want of Sustenance, which is an Extreme one Way, the other can naturally signify nothing else, but an Extreme the other Way, which is eating and drinking to Excess; as one signifies eating and drinking too little, so the other must naturally signify eating and drinking too much, and the *Medium* between them is to eat and drink to a Degree of Chearfulness and Fulness. And tho' the Apostle does speak many good Things of these *Corinthians*; yet this is not a sufficient Reason to understand *μεθύει* here in a Sense different from its most usual Signification. For however he may speak well of them in other Respects; yet certain it is, they were guilty of a Fault here, either just before, or at the Time of celebrating the Lord's Supper; and how great this Fault was, can no otherwise be known than from the usual Signification of the Words, by which the Apostle gives an Account of it. And



it does not follow from St. Paul's saying, *if any Man hunger, let him eat at home*, that he permitted them to do that at home, for which he censures them in this Discourse. For he might direct them to eat at home to satisfy their Hunger, that so coming to their Feasts of Charity with no View to satisfy and indulge their Appetites, they might be less liable of being guilty of Excess, and more apt to eat and drink there only as partaking of a common Meal with their Brethren, which was the Design of those Feasts.

And for the same Reason I think it needless to dispute about the Doctor's third Objection to our Author's Paraphrase, *viz.* Whether the Sickness and Death, which raged among the *Corinthians*, were the natural Effects of their Intemperance, or brought upon them immediately by the Hand of God. Because, which ever of these they were, the *Corinthians* might eat and drink in the Lord's Supper only to satisfy their Appetites as at a common Meal, and not in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*.

Fourthly, the Doctor objects to our Author's Paraphrase, " that he confounds the Manner of  
 " the *Corinthians* performing their Love-Feasts  
 " with that of their celebrating the Lord's Sup-  
 " per, as if it was all one and the same Action :  
 " And that he ascribes the Indecency of their  
 " taking *every one before other their own Supper*,  
 " and their eating it in the Church to satisfy  
 " Hunger, as an Indecency in the Act of par-  
 " taking of the Lord's Supper, when it was  
 " plainly an unbecoming Way of performing a  
 " Thing of quite another Nature." But our  
 Author does not confound the Manner of the  
*Corinthians* performing their Love-Feasts with  
 that

that of their celebrating the Lord's Supper, as if it was all one and the same Action. For his Meaning is, that as the *Corinthians* performed their Love-Feasts in a Manner unsuitable to the Design of them, by having no regard to any Thing therein, but only to satisfy their Appetites, eating and drinking only for this; and so not tarrying for one another, that they might all eat together and in common, that their mutual Love for each other might be thereby professed and preserved, which was the Design of those Feasts; so also did they partake of the Lord's Supper in a Manner unsuitable to the Design of it by eating and drinking there only to satisfy their Appetites, as at a common Meal, having no Regard to any Thing else therein; not considering the Bread and Wine as Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, nor eating and drinking them in Remembrance of him. And, for any thing which appears to the contrary, they might receive the Lord's Supper, every Man by himself, at least a few of those, who brought plentifully by themselves without staying one for another. No, says Dr. *Warren*, they could not do this, which was "contrary to the Practice of all Churches, to the Reason and Design of their meeting together, and to common Sense." As if the *Corinthians* could not act contrary to the Practice of all Churches, and to the Reason and Design of their Meeting together, and to common Sense; when St. *Paul's* reprovng them in the Manner he does in this Chapter is a plain Proof, that they had actually done so; and the Doctor allows they had so acted. For he acknowledges, that they performed their Love-Feasts in an unbecoming Way; which was plain-

228 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

ly to act contrary to the Practice of all other Churches, which performed them in a becoming Way, and to the Reason and Design of those Meetings, and by Consequence to common Sense. And if the *Corinthians* could act thus at their Love-Feasts, no sufficient Reason can be given, why they might not also act so at the Lord's Supper.

For the Reason given under the second and third Objections, there is no Reason to dispute, whether our Author has rightly translated *εἰς* by *in such a manner*, which the Doctor objects to in the fifth Place; neither does our Author translate it thus with a Design to give any other Sense to this Passage, than that which it has according to the common Translation; but only because it seems to him the more proper Translation.

Sixthly, the Doctor objects to our Author's Paraphrase, "that he has removed from the Reader's View several Verses, which are as much a Part of the Passage he proposes to examine, as any of the Verses he has paraphrased and explained. The Verses are these, "1 Cor. xi. 17, 18, 19."

17. *Now in this, that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that you come not together for the better, but for the worse.*

18. *For, first of all, when you come together in the Church, I hear that there be Divisions among you, and I partly believe it.*

19. *For there must be also Heresies among you, that they which are approved, may be made manifest among you.*

But what if these Verses are a Part of the Passage, which our Author has explained? The  
passing



passing over them in Silence can be no such great Crime, if they do not shew the Sense of this Passage to be different from that, in which our Author has explained it; which I shall make appear under the Doctor's seventh Objection.

Seventhly, the Doctor undertakes to shew,  
 " that the Interpretation our Author has given  
 " of this Passage, and the Doctrine he has built  
 " upon it, is flatly contrary to the plain and ex-  
 " press Design of the Apostle, as it appears  
 " from these very Words, which he has so dex-  
 " troussly removed from his Reader's Eyes. And,  
 " in order to this, he desires it may be observed,  
 " that the chief Vice among the *Corinthians* was  
 " *Pride*, and a high Conceit of themselves, and  
 " their spiritual Accomplishments: And that this  
 " Distemper of the Mind produced the usual  
 " Effects of it among them—Schisms,  
 " Heresies, Factions, and Party-Quarrels. And  
 " that he mentions to them the evil Consequences  
 " of this unhappy Temper from its accompany-  
 " ing them even to the Celebration of the most  
 " solemn Acts of Religion. Wherefore he tells  
 " them—*Now in this, that I declare unto*  
 " *you, I praise you not, that ye come together not*  
 " *for the better, but for the worse,* 1 Cor. xi. 17.  
 " —How this happened he tells them in  
 " the next Verse, for *first of all, when you come*  
 " *together in the Church, I hear that there be Di-*  
 " *visions among you:* For his Belief of which Re-  
 " port having given a Reason in Verse 18. he adds  
 " at Verse 20.—*When you come together there-*  
 " *fore into one Place, this is not to eat the Lord's*  
 " *Supper*—Which he proves by the Words  
 " that follow, *For in eating, every one taketh be-*  
 " fore

230 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ *fore other his own Supper ; and one is hungry  
and another is drunken.*”

After this the Doctor says, p. 44. “ Now 'tis  
“ here as plain as Words can make it, that the  
“ Apostle's Charge against the *Corinthians* is for  
“ their being divided into Schisms and Par-  
“ ties.”

It may, for ought I know, be as plain as Words  
can make it, that the Apostle's Charge against  
the *Corinthians* is for their being divided into  
Schisms and Parties ; for I do not know, whe-  
ther any Words can make it plain, and sufficient-  
ly account for all the Parts of this Passage. But  
I think it may be made much plainer, that the  
Apostle's Charge against the *Corinthians* for the  
Crime, by which they partook unworthily of the  
Lord's Supper, is for eating and drinking there-  
at only to satisfy their Appetites as at a common  
Meal. For the Reason he gives, why, when  
they came together as they did, it was *not to eat  
the Lord's Supper*, is, that *in eating every one  
took before other his own Supper*. Which im-  
plies, that, when they came together, they eat  
their *own Supper*, and not the *Lord's Supper*, having  
changed the *Lord's Supper* into their own Sup-  
per ; which they could no otherwise do, than by  
eating and drinking, when they come together,  
only to satisfy their Appetites as at their own  
common Suppers at Home, and not as the Lord  
commanded them, in Remembrance of him.  
Their thus eating and drinking might indeed be  
a Consequence of their Divisions and Parties ;  
and their thus eating and drinking is not less a Con-  
sequence of these Divisions and Parties, because  
they proceeded from the *Pride* of the *Corinthians* :  
But these Divisions and Parties are not the  
Crimes

Crimes, charged upon the *Corinthians* by the Apostle, by which particularly they did eat and drink unworthily in the Lord's Supper. This, I think, will be evident from the following Paraphrase upon these Words; in which also it will appear, that the Verses, for our Author's not mentioning which the Doctor charges him with Unfairness, do not shew the Sense of this Passage to be different from that, in which our Author explains it.

17. " Now in this, that I declare unto you,  
 " I praise you not, that you come together not for  
 " the better, but for the worse. And this hap-  
 " pens by the Divisions, which I hear there are  
 " among you, when you come together in the  
 " Church, which Report I partly believe. For  
 " there must be also Heresies among you, that they,  
 " which are approved, may be made manifest a-  
 " mong you. When ye come together therefore  
 " into one Place with these Divisions among you,  
 " you cannot eat the Lord's Supper, as it ought  
 " to be eaten. For thro' these Divisions in eat-  
 " ing every one taketh before other his own Supper,  
 " and one is hungry and another is drunken.  
 " These Divisions cause you not to wait one  
 " for another; but as soon as any are come,  
 " who have brought something to eat and drink,  
 " they immediately fall to eating and drinking  
 " without staying for those, who are to come  
 " after, and being poor have nothing to bring;  
 " and thus one is hungry, and another eats to a  
 " Degree of Fulness and Sufficiency, or even  
 " beyond."

But before I proceed farther with this Paraphrase I must here observe, that tho' *Pride* was a chief Vice among the *Corinthians*, and it produced the usual Effects of it among them,



232 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*viz.* Schisms, Heresies, Factions, and Party-Quarrels; yet no Reason appears to think, that St. Paul means *Divisions*, as proceeding from this *Pride*, by the *Divisions* mentioned in Verse 18. The Apostle had spoken of this *Pride* in the Beginning of this Epistle in the first Chapter, and had since been discoursing upon many different Subjects, and there is not the least Intimation, that he had this *Pride* in View, when he spoke of *Divisions* in this eleventh Chapter. And therefore, for any Thing which appears to the contrary, these *Divisions* might proceed from their eating and drinking, when they came together, only to satisfy their Appetites as at a common Meal. As they had made this the End of their eating and drinking, so, when they came together, they, who brought plentifully, the better to accomplish this End, divided themselves into Parties, separating themselves from, and not tarrying for those, who had little or nothing to bring. And from hence I am inclined to think, that the 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 Verses, ought rather to be paraphrased thus. 17. “ *Now in this, that I declare unto you, I praise*  
“ *you not, that you come together not for the bet-*  
“ *ter, but for the worse. For first of all, when*  
“ *ye come together in the Church, I hear that*  
“ *there be Divisions among you, that you are di-*  
“ *vided into Parties, every one taking his own*  
“ *Supper before several others are come, and*  
“ *eating as if it was his own Supper at home,*  
“ *only to satisfy his Appetite; which having*  
“ *made the End of your eating and drinking,*  
“ *when you come together in the Church, you*  
“ *divide yourselves into Parties the better to ef-*  
“ *fect it, which Report I partly believe. For*  
“ *there*

“ there must be also Heresies among you, that  
 “ they, which are approved, may be made mani-  
 “ fested among you. When ye come together there-  
 “ fore into one Place with these Divisions among  
 “ you in order to eat and drink to satisfy your  
 “ Appetites, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper.  
 “ For thro' this in eating every one taketh before  
 “ other his own Supper, and one is hungry and  
 “ another is drunken. By your eating and drink-  
 “ ing, when you come together, only to satisfy  
 “ your Appetites, and dividing into Parties for  
 “ that Purpose, you do not tarry one for ano-  
 “ ther; but as soon as any are come, who have  
 “ brought something to eat and drink, they im-  
 “ mediately fall to eating and drinking with-  
 “ out staying for those, who are to come after,  
 “ and being poor have nothing to bring; and  
 “ thus one is hungry, and another eats to a De-  
 “ gree of Fulness and Sufficiency, or even be-  
 “ yond.”—I now go on with the Paraphrase,  
 where I left off above.

“ And thus you eat and drink in your Love-  
 “ Feasts, which go before the Lord's Supper,  
 “ only to satisfy your Appetites; but not suitable  
 “ to, nor so as to answer the End and Design of  
 “ these Feasts, which is to shew forth and pre-  
 “ serve your mutual Love for one another;  
 “ which is not done by every one's taking be-  
 “ fore another his own Supper, and by your not  
 “ eating all together as of a common Feast.  
 “ And having been so regardless of the End of  
 “ those Love-Feasts, as to eat and drink in them  
 “ only to satisfy your Appetites, you continue  
 “ to be as regardless of the End of the Lord's  
 “ Supper, and eat and drink at that also without  
 “ any farther Thought, than of satisfying and  
 “ indulging

234 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ indulging your Appetites as at a common  
 “ Meal. *What? Have you not Houses to eat*  
 “ *and drink in to satisfy and indulge your Appe-*  
 “ *tites? or despise ye the Church of God, and*  
 “ *shame them, that have not? Shall I praise you*  
 “ *for partaking of the Lord's Supper in this Man-*  
 “ *ner? I praise you not.* For it is directly con-  
 “ trary to the Nature and Design of it; which  
 “ is not to eat Bread and drink Wine to satisfy  
 and indulge your Appetites as at a common  
 “ Meal: But to eat Bread and drink Wine as  
 “ the Memorials of the Body and Blood of  
 “ Christ in Remembrance of him. This ap-  
 “ pears plainly from the Words of our Lord,  
 “ when he instituted the Lord's Supper, which  
 “ I will now repeat to you. *For I have receiv-*  
 “ *ed of the Lord that, which also I delivered un-*  
 “ *to you, that the Lord Jesus the same Night, in*  
 “ *which he was betrayed, took Bread; and when*  
 “ *he had given Thanks, he brake it, and said,*  
 “ *Take, eat; this is my Body, which is broken*  
 “ *for you; this do in Remembrance of me. Af-*  
 “ *ter the same Manner also he took the Cup, when*  
 “ *he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New*  
 “ *Testament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as*  
 “ *ye drink it, in Remembrance of me. For as often*  
 “ *as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do*  
 “ *shew forth the Lord's Death 'till he come, to*  
 “ *keep up the Remembrance of it, this being*  
 “ *the End and Design of your eating and drink-*  
 “ *ing this Bread and Wine. Wherefore whoever*  
 “ *shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup of the*  
 “ *Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and*  
 “ *Blood of the Lord. But let a Man examine*  
 “ *himself, when he is going to partake of the*  
 “ Lord's Supper, by these Words of the Insti-  
 “ tution,



"tution, to direct him to have, and to satisfy  
 "him, that he hath, such Thoughts and Dispo-  
 "positions, as that he shall partake of it accord-  
 "ing to the Nature and Design of it, and so let  
 "him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup.  
 "For he, that eateth and drinketh unworthily,  
 "eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not  
 "discerning the Lord's Body, not considering and  
 "calling to Mind the Body of the Lord cruci-  
 "fied for him. For this Cause many are weak  
 "and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if  
 "we would judge ourselves, we should not be judg-  
 "ed. But when we are judged, we are chastened  
 "of the Lord, that we should not be condemned  
 "with the World. Wherefore, my Brethren,  
 "when you come together to eat, tarry one for  
 "another, be so mindful of the Design of your  
 "Love-Feasts, as to tarry one for another, and  
 "to eat together suitably to the Design of those  
 "Feasts; and this will lead you on to be so  
 "mindful of the Nature and End of the Lord's  
 "Supper, as to partake of that in a Manner  
 "suitable to the Design of it; as a Neglect to  
 "eat in a proper Manner of your Love-Feasts  
 "led you on to partake unworthily of the Lord's  
 "Supper. And if any Man hunger, let him eat  
 "at home to satisfy that; but not at your Love-  
 "Feasts, or at the Lord's Supper, that ye come  
 "not together unto Condemnation."

Without interpreting this Passage in this Sense  
 it cannot so well, if at all, be accounted for,  
 why St. Paul repeats here the Words of the In-  
 stitution. He can repeat them for no other  
 Reason, than to remind the *Corinthians* of the  
 Nature and End of the Lord's Supper; that so  
 they might examine themselves thereby, and see  
 whether

236 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

whether their Behaviour at the Lord's Supper was conformable to that Institution, and suitable to that End. And in the Account St. Paul gives of *Christ's* Institution, he particularly remarks, Verse 26. that the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper was not to eat and drink to satisfy Hunger and Thirst as at a common Meal; but to eat Bread and drink Wine as the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Remembrance of him, to keep up the Remembrance of *Christ*, or, as the Apostle expresses it, *to shew forth* the Lord's Death. And therefore the Examination he intended they should make of themselves by the Words of the Institution must be, whether they eat Bread and drink Wine at the Lord's Supper suitable to this Nature and End of it, not to satisfy Hunger and Thirst as at a common Meal, but as the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ* in Remembrance of him, and to be directed by that Examination to do so.

And here I must beg leave to ask Dr. *Warren*, how he comes to make no Mention of Verses 23, 24, 25, 26. when he takes upon him to explain this Passage of St. Paul, which are as much a Part of this Passage, as any Verses he has explained, and which make so strongly for our Author's Interpretation, that no Reason appears, why they were brought in, according to any other; or if the Doctor could give any Reason, why they were brought in, according to his Interpretation, why did he not produce it? May it not be justly applied to the Doctor, which he says to our Author? "Now this is an *Artifice* so utterly unjustifiable in any one, who takes upon himself the Part of a *Paraphrast*, that I  
" am

am really surpris'd, that even Concern for  
 " your Reputation did not guard you against a  
 " Method of proceeding so very unusual, and so  
 " liable to be suspected of Fraud. For indeed  
 " your Management herein has but an *odd Af-*  
 " *fect*, the Verses you have omitted containing a  
 " Key to the whole Passage, and being of sin-  
 " gular Use for opening, and ascertaining the  
 " Sense of it."

I have interpreted this Passage according to  
 the general Supposition, that the *Love-Feasts*  
 were joined to the Celebration of the Lord's  
 Supper, and that the Apostle reprehends the *Co-*  
*rinthians* for their Misbehaviour at these Feasts,  
 as well as at the Lord's Supper; not that I intend  
 thereby to assert, that it was so. I confess, that  
 to me no Reason appears from the Context to be-  
 lieve, that it was so, or that by *Supper* here St.  
*Paul* means any other, than the Lord's Supper,  
 or reprehended the *Corinthians* for their Misbe-  
 haviour at any other Supper. And I think it not  
 improbable, that the *Corinthians* had so abused  
 the Lord's Supper, as to have turned it into a  
 common Meal, or ordinary Entertainment; that  
 they among them, who, being able, brought a  
 plentiful Quantity of Bread and Wine, (of which  
 the poorer Sort, who were unable to bring any, had  
 a Part to eat and drink in Remembrance of *Christ*)  
 to partake of the Lord's Supper, which was the  
 original Custom; that they, I say, who brought  
 such a plentiful Quantity of Bread and Wine, as  
 soon as they were met together, immediately be-  
 gan to eat and drink of what they had brought,  
 to satisfy and please their Appetites only, as at  
 an ordinary eating and drinking, and it may be in  
 different Companies; and that in doing this  
 they



238 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

they even drunk to Excess, without any due regard to the Memory of *Christ*, and without staying for their poor Brethren, who had nothing to bring, and giving them no Part of what they brought. Whereby it happened, that, when they came together to eat the Lord's Supper, some were *drunken*, and others were *hungry*, that is, had nothing to eat and drink in Remembrance of *Christ*, had no Bread and Wine, by eating and drinking which they could receive the Lord's Supper. This I take to be the Sense of *πεινῶν* here. For the Apostle does not permit them to eat in the Church at all to satisfy their Hunger; but expressly commands them to eat at Home for that Purpose, Verse 34. *And if any Man hunger, let him eat at home.* But if *πεινῶν* signified to be hungry in a strict and proper Sense, it would imply, that the *Corinthians* were blameable for suffering their poor Brethren to go away hungry from the Church, and that it was lawful for them to eat in the Church to satisfy their Hunger; which it was not, being directly contrary to the Command of *St. Paul*, Verse 34.

I shall now proceed to our Author's Twelfth Proposition, which with others following is an Inference from this Passage of *St. Paul*, as interpreted by him.

XII. The *Examination* here mentioned by *St. Paul*, as regarding the *Lord's Supper*, is, strictly speaking, a *Christian's Examination* of his own Heart and Disposition, by the Institution of this Holy Rite, in order to assure himself that he comes to the *Lord's Supper*, and will behave himself at it, not as at a common Meal, or an ordinary

ordinary eating and drinking ; but as a particular *Rite* appointed by *Christ* : viz. That he comes to it in order to eat *this* Bread and drink *this* Wine, in a serious and Religious remembrance of *Him*, and of his *Death*.

Before I consider the Objections made to this Proposition, I shall a little explain the Meaning of it, a Misapprehension of which is the Foundation of all the Objections brought against it, and which, when it is rightly understood, immediately vanish.

1. The *Examination* here spoken of by our Author, as also the *Preparation* in the following Proposition, is that *Examination*, which is *absolutely* necessary to go before the Participation of the Lord's Supper ; as appears from what is said after this and the next Proposition.

2. That the Persons, to whom this Examination and Preparation *only* are *absolutely* necessary, are sincere and serious Believers in *Christ*, and true *Christians*, as appears from what is said after these two Propositions.

3. That tho' *only* this Examination and Preparation are *absolutely* necessary to go before the Lord's Supper ; yet *Christians* may wisely chuse to spend a longer Time in religious Consideration and Prayer, in Examination and Preparation, just before their coming to the Communion, as appears from what is said after the thirteenth Proposition.

4. That the serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*, which it is *absolutely* necessary for Persons to have, when they receive the Lord's Supper, and in order to satisfy and assure themselves, that they have it, when they receive the

Lord's

Lord's Supper, *St. Paul* requires Persons to examine themselves by the Institution of this Holy Rite, implies in it an Acknowledgment of their being the Disciples of *Christ*, and a Sense of their being obliged to obey all his Commands, and a sincere Desire and honest Resolution of doing his Will, and a Disposition towards and Resolution to amend. For which see p. 52, 148, 128 of our Author.

Having observed these Things to explain our Author's Meaning in this Proposition, I proceed to consider the Objections brought against it.

1. Dr. *Warren* objects to it, p. 52. "That  
 " our Author has not sufficient Reason to ground  
 " this Proposition upon ; and that he ought not  
 " to have affirmed it, unless *St. Paul* had ex-  
 " pressed himself so fully to this Point, that no  
 " Body could mistake his Meaning." Our Au-  
 " thor grounds this Proposition upon his foregoing  
 " Interpretation of that Passage of *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.*  
 " xi. Which Reason, how insufficient soever it is,  
 " is such an one, as the Doctor has not been able  
 " to shew the Insufficiency of it, as has been above  
 " shewn.

2. Says the Doctor, p. 54. " If a far-  
 " ther Examination, than what you express in  
 " this Proposition, viz. an Examination of a  
 " Man's whole Life by the Law of God, be so  
 " useful and commendable in itself, as you al-  
 " low, it should seem to be most suitable to do  
 " it before we come to the Lord's Supper,  
 " where we are in a more particular Manner to  
 " make a solemn Acknowledgment of our Faith  
 " in *Christ*, and of our Obligations to perform his  
 " Will according to the Terms of the Cove-



" nant he has obtained for us. And this should  
 " naturally lead us to believe, that where an  
 " *Examination* is so particularly mentioned as the  
 " Means of receiving the Lord's Supper *wor-*  
 " *thily*, it must be understood to extend to every  
 " Act of it, that is not only useful in itself, but  
 " at that Time in a more especial Manner  
 " *suitable and proper.*"

To which I answer, That tho' an Examination of a Man's whole Life by the Law of God be useful and commendable, it does not thence follow that it is *most* suitable to be done before we come to the Lord's Supper; but notwithstanding that it is useful and commendable in itself, it may be as suitable to be done at any other Time, as then. And tho' we should be naturally led to believe, that where an *Examination* is so particularly mentioned as the Means of receiving the Lord's Supper *worthily*, it must be understood to extend to every Act of it, which is not only useful in itself, but at that Time in an especial Manner *suitable and proper*; it will not thence follow, that the *Examination* particularly mentioned by St. Paul, as the Means of receiving the Lord's Supper *worthily*, is to be understood to extend to every Act of an *Examination* of a Man's whole Life by the Law of God; because every Act of such an Examination is not in an *especial* Manner *suitable and proper* as a Means to receive the Lord's Supper *worthily*: But several Acts of such an Examination are as *suitable and proper* at other Times, as Means of our living in an Obedience to the Commands of God; and all the Acts of Examination in an *especial* Manner *suitable and proper* as

242 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Means of receiving the Lord's Supper *worthily* are included in that Examination expressed by our Author in this Proposition.

3. The Doctor objects, p. 55. That our Author attempts to support this Notion of his from "the publick Office of the Church." This Objection with regard to the Exhortation of receiving the Communion, I have answered in considering Dr. Brett. As to the Exhortations appointed to be read, when Notice is given for Communion, they prove nothing against our Author. For they do not imply, that the Examination mentioned in them is absolutely necessary in all Cases, and of such an Examination only does our Author speak. And to this Purpose are those Exhortations generally understood, most, if not all, Divines allowing, that such Examination is not *absolutely* necessary to Persons, who have sincerely endeavoured to live up to the Terms of the Gospel.

To this Proposition, Dr. Brett objects, p. 55. "That if this be all the Examination, that is required to render a Man a worthy Communicant at the Lord's Table; all Divines, the whole Church of *Christ*, ancient and modern, have been hitherto deceived, who have thought it necessary on this Occasion; that a Man should examine himself as to Life and Conversation, consider whether he be truly sorry for all his Sins, and has a firm Resolution to forsake them, nay, actually has forsaken them, and begun to live as becomes a good *Christian*, and whether he believes that *Jesus Christ* is his only Saviour and Redeemer, and that there is none other Name under Heaven,

“ *whereby he must be saved, together with all other Articles of the Christian Faith.*”

But if our Author be duly considered, and rightly understood, he will be found not to have taught any Thing so contrary to the Opinion of all Divines, or of the whole Church both ancient and modern, as the Doctor pretends. For, as has been before observed, the Examination, he is here speaking of, is that, which is *absolutely* necessary to our duly partaking of the Lord's Supper; which must always necessarily go before it; and the Persons, for whom he says *only* this Examination is requisite, are sincere and serious Believers in *Christ*, or true *Christians*. But no Person can be a sincere Believer in *Christ*, or a true *Christian*, who does not really believe the Christian Religion, and sincerely resolve and endeavour to govern his Life according to the Doctrines and Precepts of the Gospel; and whoever does so, it is constantly taught by all our Divines, that he may always worthily partake of the Lord's Supper without a particular Examination of his whole Life and Conversation, and ought at any Time to receive it, when he hath an Opportunity, tho' he was not before acquainted with it, nor had Time for such an Examination of himself. But certainly they would not have taught this, had they thought it *absolutely* necessary for Persons to examine their whole Lives and Conversations in order to receive the Lord's Supper worthily. When therefore our Author teaches, that the Examination necessarily required of sincere Believers in *Christ* and true *Christians* is not an Examination of their whole Lives and Conversations, but an Examination of



244 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

their Hearts and Dispositions by the Institution of this Rite, in order to assure themselves, that they come to it as a particular Rite appointed by *Christ*, in order to eat this Bread and drink this Wine, in a serious and religious Remembrance of him and his Death, he teaches nothing contrary to what all Divines have taught before him. And he teaches this for the same End that they do, viz. That no serious *Christian*, no one, who sincerely believes in *Christ* and his Doctrine, and endeavours to govern his Life according to the Terms of the Gospel, should make it a Pretence for his not coming to the Lord's Supper, that he has not had Time for a long and particular Examination into his whole past Conduct, nor be uneasy at his honestly receiving it in Remembrance of his Lord and Master without such an Examination, p. 64. Our Author does not assert, that a Person can worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, who is not a sincere and true *Christian*, nor that an Examination of his Life and Conduct is not necessary to make a Person, who is not a sincere and true *Christian*, become such : But that an Examination of his Life and Conversation is not necessary to a true and sincere *Christian* in order to his worthily partaking of the Lord's Supper. Our Author does indeed say, that the only Examination required in a sincere and true *Christian* is, whether he be so disposed, as that he will seriously and religiously remember *Christ* and his Death at that Time, when he eats the Bread and drinks the Wine at the Lord's Supper ; but not whether he will *only* " religiously remember, that once upon a Time one *Jesus* died for " his good in general," as Dr. Brett insinuates he

he says. No, according to our Author's Doctrine, it is not sufficient, that he *only* religiously remember, that *Christ* died for our Good in general, without remembring the particular Good, for which he died. For in the serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ* and his Death, mentioned by our Author, is implied a Remembrance of *Christ* as what he really is, and of his Death, as what it really is, what it was designed to effect, what was the Design, and what was the Consequence of it ; and therefore in this Remembrance must be implied a Remembrance of the particular Good, which the Death of *Christ* was designed to effect. Neither is our Author's Meaning, as the Doctor insinuates it is, that, if a Person does all this in such a Manner *in the general*, that is, *in any Manner*, so as to distinguish it from a common Meal, he is as worthy a Receiver as the Apostle requires him to be : But if a Person does all this in such a *particular Manner*, in which *Christ* requires he should do it, so as to distinguish it from a common Meal. So that our Author no where speaks of the Examination necessary to the worthy Reception of the Lord's Supper in that light Manner, in which he is unjustly represented to do by Dr. Brett, p. 93.

Dr. Brett next says, " that our Author would  
" bring the publick Office of the Church to  
" justify this his Interpretation of St. Paul's  
" Words ; and says, it is observable, that the  
" Duty of Examination is proposed to them,  
" who are at that very Time supposed to remain  
" in the Church as Communicants. The Exhortation and Threatening of St. Paul to the *Corinthians* is then read to them : They are call-

246 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ ed upon at that very Time to judge them-  
 “ selves, and to approve themselves by coming  
 “ with proper Dispositions to the Lord’s Table,  
 “ all which must be supposed to be founded upon  
 “ this, that even so short an Examination in the  
 “ Church itself, just before the partaking of the  
 “ Bread and Wine, may be sufficient to satisfy a  
 “ true *Christian*, whether he is at that Time  
 “ coming to the Lord’s Table with a Temper  
 “ and Behaviour suitable to the Institution, ac-  
 “ cording to what *St. Paul* hath said about it,  
 “ and that he may examine and judge himself,  
 “ at that very Time, enough to be satisfied in  
 “ that essential Point.” To this, which are the  
 Words of our Author, the Doctor says, “ This  
 “ is such a Comment put upon this Exhortation  
 “ of our Church, as I am persuaded no Man  
 “ ever made before. Can any Man, who reads  
 “ the two Exhortations preceding this, one of  
 “ which is appointed to be read the Lord’s Day  
 “ before the Celebration of the Communion, be-  
 “ lieve that the Church thinks a Man, that has  
 “ not duly prepared himself for the Holy Com-  
 “ munion some Time before, can sufficiently  
 “ examine himself at the Time of his hearing  
 “ this Exhortation read to himself and o-  
 “ thers ?”

To which I answer, That by the two Exhortati-  
 ons preceding this, it appears, that the Church does  
 exhort Persons to examine their whole Lives and  
 Conduct in order to their coming worthily to the  
 Lord’s Supper ; but it does not thence follow, that  
 it exhorts them to do this, because it thinks such  
 an Examination, *absolutely* necessary towards their  
 receiving it worthily ; it may exhort them to it  
 only as to what is adviseable, and may wisely  
 and



and properly be done. It cannot think such an Examination necessary to true *Christians*, because it is certain, that it is not so<sup>a</sup>; and as for those, who are not true *Christians*, they are not concerned in what our Author says concerning the Examination necessarily previous to the Lord's Supper. Whether by the Exhortation read at the Time of celebrating the Lord's Supper the Church supposes Persons can then have Time to examine themselves as they ought to do on this Occasion, or not; it is certain, that such Persons as our Author intends, that is, true *Christians*, have then Time to examine themselves as far as is necessary, and as they ought to do on this Occasion, to be satisfied and assured, that they have the Qualifications mentioned in it, viz. "That they repent them truly for their Sins past, have a lively and stedfast Faith in *Christ* their Saviour, intend to amend their Lives, and are in perfect Charity with all Men." For these Qualifications all true *Christians* have at all Times, and therefore need only reflect upon themselves to be satisfied, that they have them. And the Reasons produced by the Doctor out of Dr. *Comber*, why the Church orders this Exhortation to be read at the Time of celebrating the Lord's Supper, do not contradict this, but perfectly agree with it.

The First is, That if any have presumed to come unprepared, they may be warned to withdraw. But how can Persons by this Exhortation be warned to withdraw as unprepared, but by their being made sensible thereby, that they have not those Qualifications mentioned in it, in

<sup>a</sup> See p. 243.

which a due Preparation consists? But they can no otherwise be made sensible by the reading of this Exhortation to them, that they have not these Qualifications, than by examining themselves by this Exhortation, while it is reading to them. If therefore there be Time for Persons, who have not the Qualifications mentioned in this Exhortation, to examine themselves by it, while it is reading to them, so as to be sensible, that they have not those Qualifications, there must be Time for Persons, who have those Qualifications, that is, for true *Christians*, to examine themselves by this Exhortation, while it is reading to them, so as to be sensible and satisfied, that they have the Qualifications mentioned in it.

The second Reason is, That Persons may act their Examination over again, while this Exhortation is reading. But if there be Time for a Person, who has examined into his whole past Conduct just before his coming to the Lord's Supper, to act that Examination over again, while this Exhortation is reading, there must be Time, while it is reading, for a true *Christian* to examine himself by it, so as to be sensible and satisfied, that he has the Qualifications mentioned in it; who always has those Qualifications, and needs but to reflect upon himself to be sensible and satisfied, that he has them. There certainly cannot be longer Time required for this Reflection, than is requisite to act over again that Examination. Our Church therefore is so far from supposing, that a Man, *such a Man* as our Author speaks of, that is, *a true and sincere Christian*, cannot sufficiently examine himself after hearing this Exhortation, or rather *while it is reading*, that it cannot

cannot but suppose it, and both the Reasons produced by Dr. Brett, why the Church orders this Exhortation to be read to the People at the Time of celebrating the Lord's Supper, confirm this Supposition.

But says the Doctor, "When the Church says  
" in this Exhortation, *Judge therefore yourselves,*  
" *Brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord,*  
" &c. she plainly supposes, that they have examined themselves duly before their coming  
" thither, for Examination must precede Judgment, otherwise a Judgment cannot be rightly formed." But tho' the Church does say in this Exhortation, *Judge therefore yourselves, Brethren, &c.* and tho' Examination must precede Judgment, this does not imply a Supposition, that Persons must have examined themselves before their coming thither; it does not imply, that the Judgment, to which they are exhorted, must be preceded by an Examination of themselves before they come thither. For, as appears, they may examine themselves, while they are there, while this Exhortation is reading, and that Examination may be sufficient to precede that Judgment, and for it to be formed upon.

The Church, by ordering this Exhortation to be read, doubtless intends, that all Persons should make that Use of it, which best suits their Circumstances. If a Person comes to the Lord's Supper, who has always, at least for some considerable Time before, been a true and sincere *Christian*, has truly and sincerely obeyed the Commands of *Christ*, and has not examined into his whole past Conduct just before his coming there, as being under no Obligation, and also



not having an Opportunity, so to do, by this Exhortation the Church can only intend to move such a Person to revive, and actually to exercise, so far as can be done at that Time, those Dispositions and Qualifications, which he has habitually in him. If a Person comes to the Lord's Supper, who has been an habitual Sinner, and is but just become a true and sincere Disciple of Christ, in order to become which he examined into the whole past Conduct of his Life just before his coming to the Lord's Supper, by this Exhortation the Church may intend to move such a Person briefly to recollect his Examination, which he has made of himself a few Days before. If it should be said, that it plainly appears by this Exhortation, that the Church requires all Persons whatsoever particularly to examine their whole past Lives and Conversations before they come to the Lord's Supper; I answer, that the Church can appear to require this from all Persons *only* as what may wisely be done, but not as what is necessary; because such an Examination is not *absolutely* necessary to all Persons, in order to their coming worthily to the Lord's Supper.

XIII. The Duty of *Preparation* for the *Holy Communion* being entirely founded on these few Words of St. Paul, *Let a Man examine himself*; it is evident from the foregoing *Proposition*, that the Preparation implied in these Words, as necessary and sufficient, is such a Consideration of the *Institution* itself, as may satisfy and assure us that we come to the *Lord's Supper*, as his sincere Disciples, resolved to *eat* and *drink* in a religious Remembrance of him; or with Dispositions and

a Be-

a Behaviour, *worthy* of, that is, suitable to, the Design of this holy Rite.

To this Proposition Dr. *Brett* objects nothing particular : and Dr. *Warren* says, p. 61. that it stands altogether upon the foregoing, and must therefore fall with it. And, as I have shewn, that the foregoing is not overturned, so this must continue standing.

XIV. It is evident from the Passage now before us, that the whole Affair of *eating* and *drinking* UNWORTHILY, in St. *Paul's* Sense, is confined to the Frame of our Minds, and our Behaviour, AT the very Time of our Performance of this religious Duty.

In Objection to this Proposition, Dr. *Brett* says, p. 96. " And is it to be supposed that a Man, a be  
 " who has lived in a constant Course of Sin,  
 " or who, tho' he have not been guilty of any  
 " gross wilful Sins, has yet had his Mind so  
 " filled with the Cares of the World, as to have  
 " neglected all Thoughts of Religion, and religious Duties, can in a Moment, and without  
 " previous Consideration, and due Examination  
 " of his Conscience, frame his Mind, however  
 " he may his Behaviour, to a right Performance  
 " of this religious Duty ? Can he in a Moment,  
 " satisfy himself (as this Author in the very  
 " next Paragraph teaches he ought to do) that  
 " he is *a sincere Disciple of Christ, and under a*  
 " *Sense of his own strict Obligations as such,*  
 " when his Conscience tells him, that *Christ* has  
 " not been in his Thoughts for many Days, or  
 " it may be for many Months and Years ?"  
 To which I answer, That the Person here described by the Doctor, is not such a Person, as  
our

252 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

our Author intends, and for whom he teaches the Examination mentioned by him is sufficient. The Person intended by our Author is a true and sincere Disciple of *Christ*; but a true and sincere Disciple of *Christ* never lives in a constant Course of Sin, nor has his Mind so filled with the Cares of the World, as to neglect all Thoughts of Religion and religious Duties, nor is he without *Christ* in his Thoughts for many Days, Months, or Years; and therefore what Dr. *Brett* says under this Proposition no Way contradicts our Author.

To this Proposition Dr. *Warren* objects thus, p. 62. “ You say the whole Affair, (for so you  
“ odly term it) of eating and drinking unwor-  
“ thily, is confined to the Time of our Perfor-  
“ mance of this Duty. So that whatever gross  
“ Impieties a *Christian* may have been guilty  
“ of,—and comes to that *Holy Table* without  
“ any Degree of Repentance or Remorse for his  
“ Sins; he may, notwithstanding all this, partake  
“ of the Lord’s Supper, not only innocently, but  
“ worthily, if the Frame of his Mind, and his  
“ Behaviour be but serious, and agreeable to the  
“ Design of the Institution, AT the Time of his  
“ doing so.” Yes, so he may; and what will  
follow from thence? Not what the Doctor ima-  
gines, viz. That a Person can partake worthily  
of the Lord’s Supper without any Degree of Re-  
pentance or Remorse for his Sins; except a Per-  
son, who has been guilty of gross Impieties, can,  
without any Degree of Repentance or Remorse  
for his Sins, frame his Mind and Behaviour so se-  
riously, as to be agreeable to the Design of the  
Lord’s Supper, at the very Time of his partaking  
of it; which it is impossible for him to do. A  
Person,



Person, who has been a wilful Sinner, cannot frame his Mind and Behaviour so seriously as to be agreeable to the Design of the Lord's Supper at the very Time of his partaking of it, if he has no Degree of Repentance or Remorse for his Sins. For the Design of the Lord's Supper, according to the Sense of St. Paul, and our Author, is, that Persons should have a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*, when they receive it. And, according to our Author, this Remembrance implies in it, that they be true and sincere *Christians*, and Believers in *Christ*, acknowledge themselves to be his Disciples, have a Sense of their Obligation to obey his Commands, and a sincere and honest Resolution of doing his Will, and a Disposition towards and Resolution to amend. But a Person, who has no Degree of Repentance or Remorse for his Sins, cannot have these Qualifications, and so cannot worthily partake of the Lord's Supper.

From this Proposition Dr. Warren infers, that a Person, who has been a wilful Sinner, can partake worthily of the Lord's Supper without any Degree of Repentance or Remorse for his Sins; whereas it can be only inferred from it, that a Person, who has been a wilful Sinner, can partake worthily of the Lord's Supper, if he so far repent of his Sins, as to frame his Mind and Behaviour so seriously as to be agreeable to the Design of this Institution AT the very Time of his partaking of it; I say, AT the very Time of his partaking of it. For it is not his having a Frame of Mind and Behaviour suitable to the Design of this Rite either before or after ~~his~~ partaking of it, his which will make him a worthy Partaker. Tho' a Person has a Frame of Mind and a Behaviour suitable

## 254 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

suitable to the Design of this Rite before he partakes of it, and likewise afterwards, yet if he has not a Frame of Mind and Behaviour suitable to the Design of it AT the very Time of his partaking of it, he partakes of it unworthily. So likewise, tho' a Person has not a Frame of Mind and Behaviour suitable to the Design of this Rite, before he partakes of it, and also afterwards, yet if he has a Frame of Mind and Behaviour suitable to the Design of it AT the very Time of his partaking of it, he partakes of it worthily. But let me not be mistaken here, in our Author has been, and thought to affirm what implies, that a Person, who has been a wilful Sinner can receive the Lord's Supper worthily, without any Degree of Repentance or Remorse for his Sins. For all, that is implied in what I have said, is, that if a Person has been a wilful Sinner, he may receive the Lord's Supper worthily, if he so far repents of his Sins, as to have a Frame of Mind and Behaviour suitable to the Design of this Rite AT the very Time of his receiving it. But it is impossible for a Person to have such a Frame of Mind and Behaviour AT the very Time of his receiving the Lord's Supper without any Degree of Repentance or Remorse for his Sins<sup>a</sup>.

The Doctor goes on, p. 63. " But you say  
 " expressly, that if *some among the Corinthians*  
 " *had not been guilty of great and criminal Indecencies at the very Time of the Celebration,*  
 " *had not heard of the Crime and Danger of eating and drinking unworthily.* By which you  
 " affirm, or there is neither Sense nor Meaning

<sup>a</sup> See under Prop. xv.

in what you say, that no Crimes, how gross soever, tho' utterly unrepented of, can disqualify any *Christian*, for partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, nor can bring Guilt or Punishment upon him for so doing, but what are committed in the very Act of *receiving*." But how is this affirmed in saying, *That some among the Corinthians, being guilty of great and criminal Indecencies at the very Time of the Celebration, gave the only Occasion to St. Paul to speak, and, by Consequence, was the only Occasion of our bearing, of the Crime and Danger of eating and drinking unworthily.* For this is all which is affirmed or meant in saying, *Had not some amongst the Corinthians been guilty of great and criminal Indecencies at the very Time of the Celebration, we had not heard of the Crime and Danger of eating and drinking unworthily.* Tho' the *Corinthians* ate and drank unworthily, by being guilty of Indecencies at the very Time of the Celebration, and tho' it be the Design of *St. Paul* in this Epistle to reprehend them for Crimes, which they were guilty of at the very Time of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*; yet it does not thence follow, that Persons cannot be guilty of Crimes at other Times, which, if unrepented of, would disqualify them for partaking of the *Lord's Supper*; unless it be supposed, that no Crimes committed by Persons at other Times can disqualify them for partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, or that *St. Paul* necessarily intends to reprehend them in this Passage for all the Crimes, which they could at any Time be guilty of.

The Doctor asks, p. 65. "But how dares any one say, that we had not heard of the Crime and Danger of eating and drinking unworthily



## 256 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“worthily, if it had not been for this criminal Indecency of the *Corinthians*?” The Supposition of the Daringness of this Assertion is founded in this, as appears from what the Doctor says farther in this Paragraph, that if we had not had this Direction of *St. Paul*, concerning the Examination necessary to qualify Persons to partake worthily of the Lord’s Supper, we should not have had any sufficient Rule to direct us in this Point. To which I answer, that, without this Direction, the Words of the Institution are sufficient for this; we may thence learn, how we ought to be qualified to partake worthily of the Lord’s Supper, by considering the Nature and Design of it there declared.

XV. Whoever therefore eats *this* Bread and drinks *this* Wine, with a serious and Christian Frame of Mind; and a Behaviour *suitable* to the Design of the *Institution*; partaking of it as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, under the Sense of his own strict Obligations, as such; remembering his *Body* broken and his *Blood* shed at the same Time; and doing the whole in *Remembrance* of *Christ*, as his Lord and Master; certainly cannot be said to *eat* and *drink* UNWORTHILY; or, as far as *this* particular religious Action is concerned, to behave himself *unsuitably* to it, or to his own Character, as a *Christian*.

To this Proposition, Dr. *Brett* particularly objects nothing.

Dr. *Warren*, allows this Proposition to be true considered in itself; but denies it to be a Consequence of the foregoing Propositions; because he has proved those Propositions to be false; and that *St. Paul*, in this Passage to the *Corinthians*, requires

requires a different Examination and Preparation, than what is expressed in them. But as it appears from what I have said, that the Doctor has not proved those Propositions to be false, nor that St. Paul requires a different Examination and Preparation, than what is expressed in them; this Proposition, for any Thing the Doctor has proved to the contrary, is a Consequence of the foregoing Propositions.

But what the Doctor affirms, p. 69. I am afraid is not true: "That no Person can partake  
" of the Lord's Supper in the Manner described  
" in this Proposition, but he must have brought  
" himself to this excellent Frame of Mind, by  
" a great deal of previous Consideration; by  
" having actually looked back upon his past  
" Life, reformed his Corruptions, strengthened  
" his good Resolutions, and raised his Desires  
" after Perfection." For if a Person be a true Believer in, and a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, who sincerely endeavours to obey his Commands, without which he cannot be a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, he may certainly partake of the Lord's Supper in the Manner, and with that excellent Frame of Mind, described in this Proposition, without a great deal of previous Consideration, without actually looking back upon his past Life, reforming his Corruptions, strengthening his good Resolutions, and raising his Desires after Perfection. If a Person be a great and an habitual Sinner, he cannot indeed become a sincere *Christian* without a great deal of previous Consideration, and actually looking back upon his past Life, and reforming his Corruptions; I say, it is morally impossible for a great and an habitual Sinner to become a sincere *Christian* without this; but that it is naturally impossible without this cannot be proved,  
S excepting

258 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

excepting the reforming his Corruptions: But after a Person is by this Means become a true *Christian*, he may partake of the Lord's Supper in the Manner described in this Proposition without a great deal of previous Consideration, & just before he is going to partake of it.

Again, if a Person has once partook of the Lord's Supper in the Manner described in this Proposition, and continues afterwards in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ* until he comes to it again, and so from Time to Time, he may certainly partake of the Lord's Supper in the Manner here described without a great deal of previous Consideration, without actually looking back upon his past Life, without reforming his Corruptions, strengthening his good Resolutions, and raising his Desires after Perfection.

The Doctor goes on, p. 69. " So that altho' " this Proposition is indeed true, and the Per- " son, you describe in it, does certainly discharge " this Duty worthily; yet it is in Virtue of that " Preparation, the Necessity of which it is the " Design of your Book to destroy." The Preparation here meant is an Examination of a Man's past Conduct, truly repenting of the Sins, which he perceives himself to have been guilty of, and sincerely resolving to forsake them, and amend his Life. But the Person described in this Proposition does not discharge this Duty of receiving the Lord's Supper worthily in Virtue of that Preparation, so as that it is always necessary for this Preparation immediately to precede his receiving the Lord's Supper, or that it is necessary for him always thus to prepare himself before he goes to it; because, as appears from what has been just said, a Person may discharge this Duty worthily without such a Preparation.

But



But how does our Author design to overthrow this Preparation? He designs to overthrow it no farther, than to shew, that it is not *absolutely* necessary to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper; and that it is not a Duty *peculiar* to it, so as to be required particularly upon that Account. This appears from what he says after the thirteenth Proposition. In that Proposition he says, that "the Preparation, which is necessary and sufficient for the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper, is such a Consideration of the Institution itself, as may satisfy and assure us, that we come to the Lord's Supper, as his sincere Disciples, resolved to eat and drink in a religious Remembrance of him." — And after he says, "A true Christian needs not any length of Time to assure his Heart of this. Neither can the Opportunities of this Solemnity come so suddenly upon him, but that he may certainly know himself to be prepared in this absolutely necessary Sense: And let it be remembred, that I am now speaking only of what is absolutely necessary." Now if a Person can receive the Lord's Supper worthily without the Preparation here intended by Dr. *Warren*, then is not that Preparation *absolutely* necessary. And it is certain that the Person here mentioned and intended by our Author, *viz.* a true *Christian*, one, who sincerely believes in *Christ*, and endeavours to obey his Commands, it is certain, I say, and confessed by all, that such a Person can receive the Lord's Supper worthily without that Preparation here intended by Dr. *Warren*. And of such a Person only does our Author speak, when he says, "The Preparation necessary and sufficient is such a Consideration of

260 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ the Institution itself, as may satisfy and assure  
 “ us, that we come to the Lord’s Supper,  
 “ as his sincere Disciples, resolved to eat and  
 “ drink in a religious Remembrance of him.”  
 Which appears still farther from what he says,  
 p. 81. “ I say this of serious *Christians*, who sin-  
 “ cerely believe in *Christ*, as their Master and  
 “ Judge. As for others, I am not now speak-  
 “ ing of them.”

But our Author does not appear to design so  
 to overthrow the Preparation intended by Dr.  
*Warren*, and his other Adversaries, as to teach,  
 that a great and habitual Sinner can partake of  
 the Lord’s Supper worthily without such a Pre-  
 paration, except he can become a true Penitent  
 without it. For he plainly teaches, how strongly  
 soever his Adversaries affirm the contrary, that  
 no Person can worthily receive the Lord’s Sup-  
 per, who is an habitual Sinner, or who has not  
 repented of his Sins; and by Consequence the  
 Preparation intended by Dr. *Warren*, is as neces-  
 sary to such a Person before he can partake wor-  
 thily of the Lord’s Supper, as it is necessary to  
 him in order to his becoming a true Penitent.  
 But then with regard to such a Person it is his  
 Meaning, that what is contained in that Prepa-  
 ration is not *primarily* and *particularly* necessary  
 to him in order to his partaking worthily of the  
 Lord’s Supper, but in order to his becoming a  
 true Penitent; that it is not a Duty *peculiar* to  
 the Lord’s Supper, nor required of him upon  
 the Account of it; but is what would have been  
 equally his Duty, tho’ the Lord’s Supper had  
 never been instituted; and that it is at all Times  
 his Duty, tho’ he has no Design nor Opportu-  
 nity to receive the Lord’s Supper. And it is  
 evident,

evident, that what is always a Duty, is not peculiar to the Lord's Supper, nor required particularly upon the Account of it, which is celebrated only at some particular Times. That our Author teaches, that no Person can worthily receive the Lord's Supper, who is an habitual Sinner, or who has not repented of his Sins, is manifest. For he says, that in order to partake of the Lord's Supper worthily, a Person must partake of it, as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, in Remembrance of *Christ*, as his Lord and Master, Prop. xv; and that in that Remembrance is implied a Sense and Acknowledgment of his Obligation to obey all the Commands of *Christ*, p. 52; and a Disposition towards and a Resolution to amend, p. 128; and that the worthy Performance of this Duty is accompanied with a sincere Desire, and implies in it an honest Resolution, of doing the Will of God, p. 148. But no Person, who is an habitual Sinner, and has not repented of his Sins, so far as to be truly sorry for them, and sincerely disposed and resolved to forsake them, can be a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, have a Disposition and Resolution to amend, and a sincere Desire and honest Resolution of doing the Will of God; and therefore such a Person cannot worthily receive the Lord's Supper according to what our Author teaches.

Having thus shewn our Author's true Meaning concerning the Examination and Preparation necessary to the worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper, and thereby vindicated him from the Mistakes and Misrepresentations of his Adversaries, I proceed to the sixteenth Proposition.



XVI. He only ought to be affrighted at the Words of St. Paul, because He only can, in the *Apostle's* Sense, be said to *eat and drink unworthily*, who, without considering the Duty he professes to perform; without a serious regard to the *Remembrance* of his Lord and Master, for which only it was commanded; *eats this Bread and drinks this Wine*, either with no Thought at all of the End of the *Institution*; (which is one Degree of doing it *unsuitably* to the Nature of the Thing;) or, (which is worse) with Thoughts and Behaviour utterly *inconsistent* with the Design of this *Holy Rite*, or with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time.

This Proposition Dr. Warren says, "is introduced by our Author, as he supposes, with no small Satisfaction to himself; but that it appears monstrous to others." I suppose amongst the others, to whom this Proposition seems monstrous, the Doctor includes himself. But it is *monstrous* how this Proposition can seem monstrous to any one, who allows the fifteenth Proposition to be true. In that Proposition our Author declares, what Qualifications render a Person worthy to partake of the Lord's Supper, which Proposition the Doctor allows to be true, so that he, who has those Qualifications, may worthily partake of it. In this Proposition he declares, what Qualifications render a Person unworthy to partake of the Lord's Supper. In doing which he names such Qualifications, as either are, or imply the direct contrary to all those mentioned in the fifteenth Proposition. If therefore that Proposition be true, this must be true also; if a Person can worthily partake of the Lord's Supper with the Qualifications mentioned

in

in that Proposition, -he only can be unworthy to partake of it, who wants any one of those Qualifications; so that it is strange this Proposition should appear monstrous to the Dr. who acknowledges the former to be true. And indeed the Dr. *only* says, that this Proposition appears to be *monstrous*; but gives no Reason to prove, that it really is so: But goes on to object to what is said after it.

In the next Paragraph he says, our Author asserts in this Proposition, " That they only can be said to eat and drink unworthily, who perform this Duty either with no Thought at all of the End of the Institution, or with Thoughts and Behaviour inconsistent with it." Our Author adds, " or with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time." I will not pretend to say, that the Doctor omitted these Words with Design; perhaps he thought they were included in the foregoing, *viz.* " With Thoughts and Behaviour inconsistent with it," as indeed they are. However their being added in the Proposition makes the Sense of those foregoing Words more plain and determined, and evidently shews, that our Author does not intend to teach, that Persons can worthily receive the Lord's Supper without repenting of their Sins. For whoever is impenitent, his Thoughts and Temper are inconsistent with the Duty of a *Christian*, and therefore he ought to be affrighted at the Words of St. Paul from coming to the Lord's Supper.

In order to explain what he asserts in this Proposition the Doctor says, " our Author makes a Distinction between a *good, serious Christian*, and a *professed Christian*. Of the former he says, it is *morally* impossible that he should eat

“ this Bread without a due religious Remem-  
 “ brance of the Death of his Master ; but that it  
 “ is not *naturally* impossible, but he may fail in  
 “ this ; and when he does thus fail, tho’ he be  
 “ in other respects unblameable, he says he may  
 “ justly be said, to eat and drink unworthily, not  
 “ discerning the Lord’s Body ; and he ought to  
 “ have added, that he thereby eats and drinks  
 “ his own Damnation.”

“ Now this, says the Doctor, is an hard Say-  
 “ ing, and is to place a Matter of the greatest  
 “ Consequence in Events, that are dubious, and  
 “ not within our own Power. For if it be *mo-*  
 “ *rally impossible*, that a serious *Christian* should  
 “ offend in this Manner, he can offend therein  
 “ only by some *natural* Infirmary, which no hu-  
 “ man Guard nor Resolution can prevent.” But  
 how does the Doctor know that ? If he knows it,  
 it is more than any one knows besides himself,  
 and therefore he would have done well to have  
 proved it. For, because it is *morally* impossible  
 for a good serious *Christian wilfully* to receive the  
 Lord’s Supper unworthily, with Thoughts and  
 Behaviour unsuitable to the Design of it, is it  
 therefore *naturally* impossible for him *wilfully* to  
 receive it unworthily, with Thoughts and Beha-  
 viour unsuitable to it ? No, certainly. Any Per-  
 son, who knows what a *natural* Impossibility  
 means, can see, that it is not so. Nothing is  
*naturally* impossible, which does not imply a  
 Contradiction, and which is absolutely impossible  
 to be conceived or done. But it does not imply  
 a Contradiction, nor is it absolutely impossible for  
 a good and serious *Christian wilfully* to receive the  
 Lord’s Supper with Thoughts and Behaviour un-  
 suitable



suitable to the Design of it. For Proof of which I need only appeal to any good and serious *Christian*, even to the Doctor himself, if it be not in his Power to go to Church, and eat and drink the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper with Thoughts and Behaviour unsuitable to the Design of that Holy Rite, by fixing his Thoughts chiefly upon something else than God, or *Christ*, or Religion, and by behaving irreverently and indecently; which would not be in his Power, if there was a *natural* Impossibility for him to do so. So that tho' it be *morally* impossible for a good and serious *Christian* to receive the Lord's Supper unworthily; yet it is *naturally* possible for him to offend in that Manner, without doing it thro' some natural Infirmary, which no human Guard nor Resolution can prevent. And to say, that tho' it is *morally* impossible for a good and serious *Christian* to receive the Lord's Supper unworthily, yet it is *naturally* possible for him to do so, is not to place his receiving it worthily "in Events, that are dubious and not within our own Power." For that is not placed in Events, which are dubious, or uncertain whether they will happen or not, and which are not within our own Power, for our not doing which there is a *moral* Impossibility, tho' there be a *natural* Possibility of it. But that, which it is *morally* impossible for us not to do, as it is for a good and serious *Christian* not to receive the Lord's Supper worthily, tho' there be a *natural* Possibility, that he may not do it, is placed in Events, which are so far from being dubious, or uncertain whether they will happen, that there is almost the highest Degree of Certainty, that they will happen, and which Events are also entirely in our own Power, otherwise

otherwise it would not be *morally* impossible for us not to do it.

Neither does it follow, that he, who receives the Lord's Supper with Thoughts and Behaviour unsuitable to the Design of it by some natural Infirmary, shall be answerable for this; as one who is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord; because *he* will be thus answerable for it, who receives the Lord's Supper with Thoughts and Behaviour unsuitable to the Design of it, not by some Infirmary, but wilfully, by a careless Inattention and Confusion of Thought, which it was wholly in his Power to avoid. Neither does it contradict the Supposition of its being *morally* impossible for a good and serious *Christian* to indulge himself in Thoughts and Behaviour unsuitable to the Design of the Lord's Supper at the Time of his partaking of it, so as to receive it unworthily, to say, that it is *naturally* possible for him to do so. For that, which is *morally* impossible, may be *naturally* possible.

And as the Doctor has been thus unsuccessful in objecting to what our Author says concerning a *good and serious Christian*; so he has succeeded no better in his Objections to what is said of a *professed Christian*.

“ Now of the *professed Christian*, whom you  
 “ suppose to be blameable in some Parts of the  
 “ Conduct of his past Life; and to have be-  
 “ haved himself unworthily, or unsuitable to so  
 “ holy a Religion, you say, says the Doctor,  
 “ p. 74. if he comes to the Lord's Table with  
 “ a serious Frame of Mind, on purpose to re-  
 “ member *Christ*, as his Lord and Master, in  
 “ the Way appointed by himself, and actually  
 “ does so remember him.” Our Author's Words  
 are,

are, "and actually partaking of the Lord's Supper with that religious Remembrance, which is suitable to it;—such an one cannot be said to eat this Bread and drink this Wine unworthily." "In saying this, the Doctor says, there is nothing made necessary for this Man's partaking of the Lord's Supper in a *worthy* and an acceptable *Manner*, but a present Attention to the *sacred Action* he is performing; if he has but quickness of Faculties enough to secure him against *wild* and wandering Thoughts, all is safe, tho' he comes without any Degree of Repentance for the Offences he is by you supposed to be guilty of, or any serious Resolution of leaving them by a more careful Conduct for the future." But in this, which our Author says of the *professed Christian*, more is made necessary for his partaking of the Lord's Supper in a worthy and an acceptable Manner, than the Doctor says there is. For it is made necessary, that he should have that *religious Remembrance* of *Christ*, which is suitable to the Design of the Lord's Supper; and then it must be necessary, that he should have all, which is implied in that Remembrance. Now in that Remembrance is implied a Sense of his Obligation to obey all the Commands of *Christ*, and a sincere Desire, Disposition, and Resolution to correct his Transgressions of them, and amend his Life<sup>a</sup>. And then in saying, *That, if a Person, who has been blameable in some Parts of the Conduct of his past Life, comes to the Lord's Table with a serious Frame of Mind on purpose to remember Christ, as his Lord and Master, in the*

<sup>a</sup> See p. 261.



268 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Way appointed by himself, and actually partakes of the Lord's Supper, with that religious Remembrance of Christ, which is suitable to it, he cannot be said to partake of it unworthily, there is certainly more made necessary for his partaking of it in a worthy and acceptable Manner, than only such a present Attention to the sacred Action, as to keep himself from wild and wandering Thoughts, without any Degree of Repentance for his past Offences, or any serious Resolution of leaving them. For in saying this there is manifestly made necessary, for the professed Christian's partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily, such a Degree of Repentance, as to be sensible of, and sorry for his past Sins, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to forsake them, and amend his Life; and I believe it will be difficult for the Doctor, or any one else, to prove a greater Degree of Repentance to be necessary for it.*

But our Author seems to have been misunderstood in what he says of the *professed Christian*, not only with regard to what is necessary for his partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper; but also with regard to what it is requisite for him to do, in order to have the Qualifications necessary for his partaking of it worthily. He seems to be understood to apply that here to the *professed Christian*, who is supposed to be guilty of wilful Sins, which he says of the *true and good Christian*, Prop. xii. and xiii. and p. 66. That the Examination and Preparation required of the *professed Christian*, as necessary and sufficient in order to his receiving the Lord's Supper worthily, is such a Consideration of the Institution itself, as may satisfy and assure him, that he comes to the Lord's Supper, as his sincere Disciple, re-  
solved

solved to eat and drink in a religious Remembrance of him; and that he needs not any length of Time to assure his Heart of this; this, I say, he seems to be understood to apply here to the *professed Christian*, and to intend, that a *professed Christian*, who is a wilful, and an habitual, notorious Sinner needs no longer Time, no more Thought and Consideration, to assure his Heart, that he comes to the Lord's Supper, as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, resolved to eat and drink in a religious Remembrance of him; than a *true* and *good Christian* needs for this Purpose. Particularly Mr. Bowyer says, p. 180. "He has  
 " not only required no more, no longer Prepa-  
 " ration of the notoriously wicked, than of the  
 " *true Christian*; but he has manifestly applied,  
 " as far as I can judge, all that he has said, unto  
 " the *profane wicked Christian*; and required no  
 " more, no longer Time of Trial, Examination,  
 " and Preparation of *him*, than he has of the  
 " *true Christian*: And it is this that has given so  
 " great Occasion of Offence." I think the  
 Place, where Mr. Bowyer imagines our Author  
 has made this Application, is this Passage con-  
 cerning the *professed Christian*, and what follows,  
 tho' he particularly refers to none, or I know  
 not where it is.

With regard to which Accusation against our  
 Author, I observe first, That it does not appear,  
 that our Author here means by the *professed Chri-*  
*stian*, who has been very blameable in some  
 Parts of the Conduct of his past Life, a Per-  
 son, who has lived in the wilful Practice of Sin  
 to the very Time of his coming to partake of  
 the Lord's Supper: But he may mean, for any  
 Thing which appears to the contrary from what

is here said, a *professed Christian*, who, tho' blameable in some Parts of the Conduct of his past Life, has been sensible of his Faults, and thought and considered of them some Time before his coming to the Lord's Supper, in order to his repenting of, and forsaking them; one, who having been a *Christian* in Profession only, but not in Practice, for some Time, at last becomes sensible of his Error, and thinks and considers of his Sins, in order to, and with a sincere Design of his repenting of, and forsaking them, even for so long a Time, as by our Church is thought sufficient for a Person to prepare himself in, to receive the Lord's Supper worthily. And then no one can justly object to his saying, that such a Person may receive the Lord's Supper worthily; nor does he, in saying so, apply the same to the *notoriously wicked Christian*, which he says of the *good and true Christian*. For here the former is supposed to have examined his past Conduct, which Examination is not necessary to the latter.

But supposing our Author to mean here a *professed Christian*, who has lived in the wilful Practice of Sin to the very Time of his coming to the Lord's Supper; to say, that, if he comes to the Lord's Supper with the same Qualifications, which the *good and serious Christian* comes with, he partakes of it worthily, is not to say, that he can have these Qualifications in so short a Time, as the *good and serious Christian* can; and that there is required no more, nor longer Thought and Consideration to beget them in the one, than in the other; and yet this, *viz.* That if a *professed Christian* comes to the Lord's Supper with the same Qualifications, which the *good and*



and *serious Christian* comes with, he partakes of it worthily, is all which our Author says here. If a *good and serious Christian* comes to the Lord's Supper with a serious Frame of Mind, and on purpose to remember *Christ*, as his Lord and Master, in the Way appointed by himself; and actually partakes of the Lord's Supper with that religious Remembrance, which is suitable to it, he partakes of it worthily: So, if a *professed Christian* comes to the Lord's Table with a serious Frame of Mind, and on purpose to remember *Christ*, as his Lord and Master, in the Way appointed by himself, and actually partakes of the Lord's Supper with that religious Remembrance, which is suitable to it, he also partakes of it worthily. Yet it does not thence follow, that they can both partake of it in this Manner with the same Ease; with spending of the same Time only in the Trial, Examination, and Preparation of themselves. Our Author therefore in saying what he does here of the *professed Christian*, does not apply all, which he has said of a *true Christian*, to the *profane wicked Christian*; nor required no more, no longer Time of Trial, Examination, and Preparation of him, than he has of the *true Christian*; and so has given no Occasion of Offence upon that Account, except to those, who do not understand him.

Our Author does not mention these Instances of the *true and professed Christian* to shew, that they can both partake of the Lord's Supper worthily with the same Ease, with spending only the same Time in the Trial, Examination, and Preparation of themselves; but, as he says, p. 72. "to explain more clearly what is meant, when "it is said, that the eating and drinking wor-  
" *thily*

“ *worthily or unworthily in St. Paul’s Sense,*”  
 “ *confined to the Disposition and Behaviour of*  
 “ *Christians at the very Time of their partaking*  
 “ *of the Lord’s Supper.*” To shew, that tho’  
 a Person be sincerely obedient to all the Com-  
 mands of *Christ*, yet he does not receive the  
 Lord’s Supper worthily, except *at the very Time*  
 of his partaking of it he eats and drinks with a  
 Disposition and Behaviour suitable to the Nature  
 and End of it: And that, tho’ a Person has  
 been wilfully disobedient to some of the Commands  
 of *Christ*; yet he may receive the Lord’s Sup-  
 per worthily, if, *at the very Time* of his partaking  
 of it, he eats and drinks with a Disposition and  
 Behaviour suitable to the Nature and End of it.  
 But it appears by what our Author says in other  
 Places, that a Person, who hath been a wilful  
 Sinner, cannot have a Disposition and Behaviour  
 suitable to the Nature and End of the Lord’s  
 Supper, except he repents of his Sins so far as  
 to be sorry for them, and sincerely desirous, dis-  
 posed, and resolved to correct them, and amend  
 his Life\*. The Disposition of Mind, or Part  
 of it, *viz.* Sorrow for his past Sins, and a sincere  
 Desire, Disposition and Resolution to obey the  
 Commands of *Christ*, which is necessary to qua-  
 lify a Person to receive the Lord’s Supper wor-  
 thily, is necessary to him, that is, it is his Duty  
 to have it, before he comes to the Lord’s Sup-  
 per, and after he is gone from it; but it is not  
 his Duty to have it at those Times upon the Ac-  
 count of the Lord’s Supper, and of partaking of  
 that worthily. For it would have been his Duty  
 to have had it, tho’ the Lord’s Supper had never

\* See p. 239.

been instituted; and it is his Duty to have it, tho' he is neither coming to, nor has received the Lord's Supper. So that it is his Duty to have that Disposition of Mind upon the Account of his partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily *only at the very Time* of his partaking of it. If it should be asked, whether a Person partakes of the Lord's Supper worthily, who continues in the wilful Practice of Sin until the very Time of his coming to it, and then eats and drinks the Bread and Wine therein, with a Disposition and Behaviour suitable to the Design of it, and, immediately after, without the least Degree of Amendment, goes and continues in the wilful Practice of Sin? I answer, That I am inclined to think it is even *naturally* impossible for such a Person to eat the Bread and drink the Wine in the Lord's Supper with a Disposition and Behaviour suitable to the Design of it; however, certain it is, that it is *morally* impossible for him to do it; and that in the highest Degree; and therefore the Case put in this Question must be so rare, if it can at all happen, that it is not worth while to dispute about it.

Actual Amendment of Life indeed our Author does not make necessary to the worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper; and it is certain, and generally acknowledged, that such an actual Amendment is not necessary, as implies a fixed, settled, and habitual Practice of Virtue: And Persons must ordinarily and generally have amended so far, as to have abstained from Sin for some Time according to our Author's Doctrine; neither can any be encouraged, from what he has said, to partake of the Lord's Supper without that Token, *viz.* That of abstaining from Sin

T

for



274 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

for some Time, of the Sincerity of their Sorrow for Sin, and of their Desire, Disposition, and Resolution to amend. For as, with regard to the *good and serious Christian*, tho' it be *naturally* possible, yet it is *morally* impossible for him to eat this Bread and drink this Cup unworthily, without a due religious Remembrance of the Death of *Christ* his Master; so, with regard to the *professed Christian*, who continues in the wilful Practice of Sin to the very Time of his coming to the Lord's Supper, tho' it be *naturally* possible, yet it is *morally* impossible, for him to eat this Bread and drink this Cup worthily, with a due religious Remembrance of the Death of *Christ* his Master. And certainly to say, that if a Person eats the Bread and drinks the Wine in the Lord's Supper with a due religious Remembrance of the Death of *Christ* his Master, he partakes of it worthily, tho' he has before been a wilful Sinner, can be no Encouragement to a Person, who is a wilful Sinner, to come to the Lord's Supper without *this* Token of the Sincerity of his Sorrow for Sin, and of his Desire, Disposition, and Resolution to amend, *viz.* *This* Token, his actual amending so far as to have abstained from Sin for some Time; when without amending so far it is *morally* impossible for him to eat that Bread and drink that Cup with a due religious Remembrance of *Christ* his Master, and to partake of the Lord's Supper worthily. It can be no Encouragement to a Person to come to the Lord's Supper with an Expectation and Hopes of receiving it worthily in a Case, wherein it is Ten thousand to one, that he does receive it worthily. And hence it appears likewise, that it must be so rare a Case,  
and

and so seldom happen, for a Person, who has been a wilful Sinner, to partake of the Lord's Supper with a Disposition and Behaviour suitable to the Design of it, without amending his Life so far, as to have abstained from Sin for some Time before he comes to it; that if any affirm, as Dr. Brett does, that such a Person does not partake of the Lord's Supper worthily, without such Amendment, tho' he does eat the Bread and drink the Wine with a Disposition and Behaviour suitable to the Design of it, it is not worth while to dispute about it. Thus much is certain, that what our Author affirms, p. 73. "That he, who performs this particular religious Duty, in a Manner, and with a Temper and Behaviour suitable to the Nature and Design of it; with a serious Remembrance of Christ, as his Lord and Master, who has a right to the Obedience of his Life, cannot be said to eat and drink unworthily in St. Paul's Sense, nor ought to be afraid of the Censure passed by him upon such as do;" it is certain, I say, that this is generally true; it is so generally and universally true, that it is *morally* impossible for a Case to happen, in which it is not true. This is sufficient for the Direction of Mankind, and it does not appear, that our Author designed to extend, what is here affirmed, to such very rare and extraordinary Cases.

Page 75, 76, and 77. Dr. Warren endeavours to shew, "That our Author, by affirming it to be *naturally* possible for a good and serious Christian to partake of the Lord's Supper unworthily, tho' it be *morally* impossible for him to do so. has given them just Cause of greater Dread and Fear, lest they should partake of

276 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ it unworthily, than they had before ; and  
 “ that, if Persons were under some Anxiety and  
 “ Disturbance of Mind before, for fear their Per-  
 “ formance of this Duty might be attended with  
 “ Danger ; if they were once persuaded of his  
 “ Notion, there would be Reason to apprehend  
 “ their Anxiety would soon grow into down-  
 “ right Distraction.” But certainly, if *good and*  
*serious Christians* were persuaded of what our Au-  
 thor says, they could have no just Cause for any  
 Dread and Fear, lest they should partake of the  
 Lord’s Supper unworthily. For, if it be *morally*  
 impossible for them to partake of it unworthily,  
 as our Author affirms, tho’ it be *naturally* possible  
 for them to do so, as he also says, there is no  
 just Cause for them to have any Dread or Fear,  
 lest they should partake of it unworthily. There  
 is no Reason for Persons to have any Dread,  
 Fear, Anxiety or Disturbance of Mind, lest  
 that should happen, of which there is a *moral*  
 Impossibility, that it does happen ; tho’ there be  
 a *natural* Possibility, that it may happen. If  
*good and serious Christians* have just Reason to be  
 fearful, anxious, and disturbed, lest they should  
 receive the Lord’s Supper unworthily, because it  
 it is *naturally* possible for them to do so, tho’  
 it be *morally* impossible ; they have just Reason  
 to be fearful, anxious, and disturbed, lest the  
 Church should fall upon their Heads, when they  
 go into it. For of its not falling there is only a  
*moral* Impossibility ; but it is *naturally* possible,  
 that it may fall. Had Persons just Reason to be  
 fearful, anxious, and disturbed, lest that Evil  
 should befall them, of which there is only a  
*moral* Impossibility, that it will not happen, but  
 it is *naturally* possible for it to happen, there  
 would



would be no Room for any Ease and Quietness of Mind in this Life, there being scarce any Calamity, if any, for which to befall us it is more than *morally* impossible; but it is *naturally* possible for it to happen.

As to what Dr. *Warren* insinuates, p. 76. That a Person may partake of the Lord's Supper unworthily thro' natural Infirmary, so as to be accountable, and punishable for it; that does not follow from its being *naturally* possible for a good and serious Christian to partake of it unworthily, as has been observed, p. 294.

The Doctor comes next, p. 78. to that Passage of our Author, where he says, "It will not follow from a Person's past Failures in other Points of Duty, that he partakes of the Lord's Supper unworthily in St. *Paul's* Sense; if his Temper and Behaviour, at the Time of partaking, be suitable to it, and worthy of a true Christian. For if this was the Case, no one, who had been a wilful Sinner, could ever partake of this Rite, otherwise than unworthily."

"Now, says the Doctor, if by a Temper and Behaviour at the Time of partaking suitable to it, and worthy of a true Christian, you mean the doing it under a real Sorrow for past Failures, attended with true Repentance, and a sincere Resolution of Amendment; then you give a new State of the Point in Question, and such as (if you avow it) stands in direct Opposition to all you have advanced against the Necessity of an Examination previous to the Time of partaking of the Lord's Supper. For by this State of the Manner of partaking of the Lord's Supper, you grant the Thing

T 3

"you

278 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ you have been all this while opposing.” But by a *Temper and Behaviour at the Time of partaking suitable to it, and worthy of a true Christian*; our Author means here, and every where else, as appears from what has been already said, *the doing it under a real Sorrow for past Failures, attended with true Repentance, so far as to have a sincere Desire, Disposition and Resolution of Amendment.* And then his Meaning so by it here can give no other State of the Question, than he has all along given; which State of the Question the Doctor has all along mistaken. And to *avow this* does not stand in direct Opposition to all he has advanced against the Necessity of an *Examination* previous to the Time of partaking of the Lord’s Supper; meaning by the Examination, an *Examination* into the whole Conduct of a Man’s past Life. For, notwithstanding *this*, such an Examination is not *absolutely* necessary to Persons before they receive the Lord’s Supper, and against the *absolute* Necessity of it only does our Author contend. And that such an Examination is not *absolutely* necessary, is manifest; because *good and sincere Christians* can partake of the Lord’s Supper with a *Temper and Behaviour* suitable to it, and worthy of a true *Christian*, without such an Examination; and so may *professed and wicked Christians* also, if they can have that *Temper and Behaviour* without such an Examination. But if they cannot, yet is that Examination no farther necessary to them, than it is necessary to beget in them that *Temper and Behaviour*. And tho’ it be necessary to beget in them that *Temper and Behaviour*; yet it is not necessary to beget in them that *Temper and Behaviour*, that

is,

is, so much of that Temper and Behaviour, as it is at all necessary to beget in them, *particularly* and *peculiarly* upon the Account of their coming to the Lord's Supper. For it is necessary to them for that purpose, tho' they have no Design nor Opportunity to come to the Lord's Supper, and would have been equally necessary, tho' the Lord's Supper had never been instituted. And thus Dr. *Warren's* Objection to this Passage of our Author appears to be founded in his misunderstanding him, and that our Author does not argue here as the Doctor represents him to do p. 80. *viz.* That because an unrepenting Sinner cannot partake of the Lord's Supper worthily, therefore a Person, once a wilful Sinner, but now in a State of Repentance, and under a full Conviction of the Baseness and Folly of his past Transgressions, cannot partake of it worthily. But he argues thus, " That if a Person, who  
 " has been a wilful Sinner, cannot partake of the  
 " Lord's Supper worthily, tho', at the Time of  
 " his partaking of it, his Temper and Behaviour  
 " be suitable to it, and worthy of a true *Chri-*  
 " *stian*, so that he is under a real Sorrow for his  
 " past Failures, attended with true Repentance,  
 " and a sincere Resolution of Amendment;  
 " then no Person, who had been a wilful Sinner,  
 " could ever partake of this Rite otherwise than  
 " unworthily." And if the Ground and Reason of receiving unworthily, does not consist in having been guilty of wilful Sins, but only in continuing still under the Power of them, and being still unresolved to leave them, as the Doctor says; then if a Person, once a wilful Sinner, cannot receive the Lord's Supper worthily when then this only Ground and Reason of his



280 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Unworthiness is removed, as it is, when he is under a real Sorrow for his past Failures, attended with true Repentance, and a sincere Resolution of Amendment, no one, who has been a wilful Sinner, can partake of this Rite otherwise than unworthily. So that our Author in this Passage does neither misunderstand his own State of the Question, nor argue from the true State of it weakly and inconsequentially.

You go on, says the Doctor and say, "The  
 " *Corinthian Christians*, were not forbid to come  
 " to the Performance of this Duty again; but  
 " were required to come in a serious and *Chri-*  
 " *stian* Manner; but without the least Encon-  
 " ragement to them to hope for God's Favour  
 " without their Amendment.—But this, says  
 the Doctor, " is not by far a true and full Re-  
 " presentation of the Case of the *Corinthian*  
 " *Christians*." But this, with what goes before, is  
 a true and full Representation of the Case of the  
*Corinthian Christians*, as far as is required for  
 the Purpose for which our Author here mentions  
 it. The only Purpose, for which he here men-  
 tions the Case of the *Corinthians*, is to shew,  
 that a Person, who has been a wilful Sinner,  
 may nevertheless partake of the Lord's Supper  
 worthily. This is what he asserts and argues to  
 prove in the latter Part of the foregoing Para-  
 graph; and he begins this with another Argu-  
 ment for it from the Case of the *Corinthians*.  
 And he argues thus, The *Corinthian* Sinners,  
 whose Guilt lay in their unchristian Behaviour at  
 this very Rite, and, if Dr. Warren chuses it, I  
 will add, in their having Divisions and Conten-  
 tions among them before they came to this Rite,  
 were not forbid to come, nor at all discouraged  
 by

by St. Paul from coming to it again, tho' they had been wilful Sinners, which they certainly would have been, if they could not afterwards partake of it otherwise than unworthily. On the contrary, it was supposed still to be their Duty; and they were required to come to it in a serious and *Christian* Manner. And the Case is the same with regard to Sinners among *Christians* at this Day. If they have been wilful Sinners, this should not discourage them from coming to the Lord's Supper. They may, notwithstanding they have been wilful Sinners, partake of it worthily, and it is still their Duty to come to it; but then they must come with a Temper and Behaviour suitable to it, which implies in it Repentance, and a sincere Resolution of Amendment.

Dr. Warren goes on, " So that what you say " at the Close of pag. 74. That the partaking of the *Lord's Supper with a serious Frame of Mind* may happily lead Men to a forsaking of all their Sins, and a total Amendment of Life, is making that the End and Effect of this Duty, which is plainly required " as the Means of duly performing it." But the forsaking of all their Sins, and a total Amendment of Life, so as to be arrived at a settled and habitual Practice of all Virtue, which is what our Author intends by it, is so far from being plainly required as a Means of duly performing this Duty, that it is required as a Means for that Purpose but by very few, if by any. The Doctor himself does not require it as a Means of duly performing this Duty. For in the foregoing Paragraph all, which he requires, is Repentance and a serious Resolution of Amendment.

Where

282 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Where by Repentance he plainly means only Sorrow for Sin, and a sincere Desire and Disposition to amend, but not an actual and total Amendment, by his adding a *serious Resolution of Amendment*, which implies, that Persons have not as yet actually and totally amended.

Dr. Warren goes on, "Very many and very great are the good Effects of this holy Ordinance : But the Doctrine of its being an Ordinance for the Conversion of Sinners has no Foundation either in this *Passage* of Scripture or any other." The Doctrine, that the Lord's Supper is an Ordinance for the Conversion of Sinners, so as that the worthy partaking of it begets in them Sorrow for Sin, and a sincere Desire, Disposition, and Resolution to amend, has indeed no Foundation either in this Passage of Scripture or any other. For their Conversion so far is necessary in order to their partaking of it worthily<sup>a</sup>; and generally and ordinarily too, tho' not absolutely, an abstaining from Sin for some Time before they come to it. But the Doctrine of its being an Ordinance for the Conversion of Sinners so far, as to lead them to the forsaking of all their Sins, a total Amendment of Life, and a settled and habitual Practice of all Virtue, tho' it has no Foundation either in the express Words of this Passage of Scripture, or any other, yet it has a Foundation in the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, as they are expressly declared in the Words of the Institution. For according to the Nature and End of it there expressly declared, we can see, that the worthy partaking of it naturally tends to revive and keep

<sup>a</sup> See p. 273.



alive in our Minds all such Thoughts, Dispositions and Tendencies, as are proper to work upon the Conduct of our whole Lives, so as to lead us to the forsaking of all our Sins, and an habitual Practice of Virtue.

Dr. Warren, comes next to the Instances of Faith and Prayer, mentioned by our Author to shew, that a Person may perform one Duty right and acceptably to God, so as not to be condemned for it, and yet be condemned for his Disobedience to other Duties.

To the first of these Instances, viz. That of Faith, the Doctor begins his Objection thus; " You suppose a Man may perform this Duty, that is, *of receiving the Lord's Supper worthily*, tho' he be an habitual Sinner; and you endeavour to illustrate the Matter by the Instance of Faith, which you say a Man may have, and may thereby *act a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God, altho' he does not regulate his Practice by the Precepts of Christ.*"

But our Author nowhere supposes, that a Man may perform the Duty of receiving the Lord's Supper worthily, tho' he be an habitual Sinner; neither does he bring this Instance of Faith to illustrate that Supposition. But he brings it, as he does also that of Prayer, to explain what he says in the latter Part of the foregoing Paragraph, That " supposing a Person not to be guilty of eating and drinking unworthily in the Lord's Supper; nor to be condemned by Almighty God upon that Account: Yet if he still goes on in his Sins, he will be condemned for those Sins."

The Doctor goes on, " Now here, altho' I think you ascribe more to the bare Act of  
" Faith

284 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ Faith without *Works*, than the *Holy Scrip-  
tures*, or the Nature of Faith will warrant,  
“ and so make an improper Choice of it to  
“ *illustrate* the Point in hand.”

What our Author here ascribes to the *bare Act* of Faith, is, that it is a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God. The bare Act of Faith here mentioned by our Author consists in being inwardly convinced of the Truth of the *Christian Religion*, and really to believe in *Jesus Christ*, as sent into the World by God. And certainly this must be a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God. For it is, what God himself commands. When God commands Men in Scripture to believe the Gospel, or to believe in *Jesus Christ*, it is included in that Command, that they should be inwardly convinced of the Truth of the *Christian Religion*, and really believe in *Jesus Christ*, as sent into the World by God. And therefore God commands Persons to do this; and certainly to do what God commands must be a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God. It is true indeed, God does not command Persons to do this only; he commands them to do more: He commands them to be influenced by this Conviction and Belief to regulate their Practice by the Precepts of *Christ*; and that too it may be in this very Command to believe in *Jesus Christ*. But nevertheless to have this Conviction and Belief is in itself a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God. But it is unacceptable to God, that they have this only; and not, that they have this Faith considered in itself: That they are not influenced by it to obey the Gospel. There can certainly be no Crime, nor any Thing unacceptable to God, in being convinced of the Truth of the *Christian Religion*,

Religion, and really believing in *Jesus Christ*; but the Crime lays in not suffering this Faith to influence them to obey the Commands of *Christ*, and this also is what is unacceptable to God. This bare Faith, as our Author says, is not only unprofitable to Persons, and unavailable towards their gaining the Favour of God; but will also aggravate their Guilt, and consequently their Condemnation; But this, not because it is in itself evil, and unacceptable to God, but because it hath a Tendency in its own Nature and Design to make Men better, which Tendency they wilfully neglect and resist. And hence it plainly appears, that this Instance of Faith illustrates the Point, for which it is brought, without supposing the very Point in Question, as the Doctor says it does. For by this Instance it appears, that tho' a Person does act a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God, by performing this one Duty of receiving the Lord's Supper aright, so as not to be condemned for the Performance of that Duty; yet, if he be a wilful Sinner in other respects, he will forfeit the Favour of God by, and be condemned for, those Transgressions.

“ Your other Instance, says the Doctor, is  
 “ that of Prayer concerning which you say,—  
 “ That a Person may possibly perform this Duty  
 “ with his Understanding and Affections suitably disposed for it, and yet relapse into the  
 “ Practice of Sin;”—And that—“ This unhappy Man will not be condemned by God, for  
 “ performing this Duty of Prayer with Dispositions suitable to it; but that he will be condemned, notwithstanding this, for the wilful  
 “ Practice of Sin.”

“ I think



“ I think, says the Doctor, you have not  
 “ stated this Matter with the utmost Accuracy;  
 “ but I suppose your Meaning is this; that as a  
 “ Man may *pray to God* in an *acceptable Manner*,  
 “ and so as not to incur the Danger of Punish-  
 “ ment for so doing, and yet may come before  
 “ God under the Guilt of unrepented Sins; so  
 “ also he may partake of the *Sacrament of the*  
 “ *Lord's Supper* without offending God thereby,  
 “ tho' he comes under the *same Guilt*, provid-  
 “ ed he does it in a serious Remembrance of  
 “ *Christ*.”

But I think, that the Doctor has here, as in  
 many other Places, mistaken our Author's Sense.  
 For his Meaning is not that, which the Doctor  
 supposes it to be; but his Meaning is plainly  
 this: That tho' a Man prays to God in an ac-  
 ceptable Manner, and so as not to incur the  
 Danger of Punishment for so doing, by praying  
 with his Understanding and Affections suitably  
 disposed for it; yet if he relapse into the Practice  
 of Sin, that he will be condemned and punished  
 for the wilful Practice of Sin, tho' he has per-  
 formed the Duty of Prayer aright, and will not  
 be condemned for so performing it: So also that  
 tho' a Man partakes of the Sacrament of the  
 Lord's Supper without offending God thereby,  
 by partaking of it with a sincere, and serious Re-  
 membrance of *Christ*, yet if he be a wilful sin-  
 ner afterwards, he will be condemned and pu-  
 nished for his wilful Disobedience, tho' he has  
 partook of the Lord's Supper worthily, and will  
 not be condemned for so partaking of it.

Now according to this Sense our Author has  
 stated the Matter with the utmost Accuracy;  
 and in order to make this Instance to his Purpose,  
 there

there is no Occasion, as the Doctor says there is, either "to shew, that *Christians* may perform "the *Duty of Prayer acceptably* at the same "Time, that they perform it with the Guilt of "unrepented Sins upon them; not that the Case "of praying to God is in all Points parallel to "the Case of partaking of the Lord's Supper."

For first, tho' the Doctor indeed says, that *Christians* may make their Prayers to God in an acceptable Manner, tho' under the Guilt of wilful Sins unrepented of; yet our Author neither says, nor supposes any such Thing; but the contrary, and proves it also. He says, that if a Man prays to God with Dispositions agreeable to that Duty, he will not be condemned for so praying, and consequently prays in an acceptable Manner. But in the *Dispositions agreeable to the Duty of Prayer*, he includes Repentance for Sins, so far as to be sorry for, and disposed and resolved to forsake them. This is manifest from what follows. For he says, if a Person be *wickedly disposed* at the very Time when he prays, his Prayer is unacceptable, and by Consequence he does not pray with Dispositions agreeable to this Duty. Now if a Person does not so far repent of his Sins, as to be sorry for them, and disposed and resolved to forsake them, he is *wickedly disposed*; he is still disposed to continue in Sin, if he has no Manner of Concern nor Regret for having committed, nor is disposed nor resolved to forsake it; and therefore if a Person does not so far repent of his Sins, he cannot pray to God with Dispositions suitable to this Duty, nor in an acceptable Manner. And then how can Doctor *Warren* presume to say, as he does,

p. 86. "That *Christians* under the Guilt of wilful Sins may make their *Prayers* to God in an acceptable Manner." And that by *the Guilt of wilful Sins*, he there means, that persons have not so far repented of their Sins, as to be sorry for them, and disposed and resolved to forsake them, appears from his saying in Opposition to this, p. 87. That Persons cannot make that religious and solemn Declaration, which is implied in partaking of the Lord's Supper, without a sincere Sorrow for their Transgressions, and a firm Resolution of more Care for the future. Our Author says indeed, "Who would not encourage such a Person, *viz. Who forms the Duty of Prayer with Disposition suitable to it*, tho' a Sinner, to make his Addresses to God by Prayer, in order to the Amendment and Reformation of his Life?" *Tho' a Sinner*, by which he means a Sinner so far, as not to have mended and reformed his Life; but not so far, as not to be sorry for, disposed and resolved to forsake his Sins.

Neither, Secondly, is it necessary to shew, that the Case of *Praying* to God is in all Points parallel to the Case of partaking of the Lord's Supper, in order to make this Instance to our Author's Purpose. For tho' these two Cases are not in all Points parallel; yet does this Instance explain that, for the Explanation of which it is brought. What it is brought to explain is, that tho' a Person partakes of the Lord's Supper worthily, and is not condemned for so doing; yet if he be afterwards a wilful Sinner, he will be condemned for the wilful Practice of Sin. And this is very well explained by this Instance of Prayer. For as in the Case of Prayer, tho' a Person does rightly perform this Duty; yet if he afterwards relapse into



into Sin, tho' he will not be condemned for rightly performing the Duty of Prayer; yet he will be condemned for the wilful Practice of Sin. So in the Case of the Lord's Supper, tho' a Person does rightly perform the Duty of partaking of it; yet if he be afterwards a wilful Sinner, tho' he will not be condemned for rightly performing this Duty, yet he will be condemned for the wilful Practice of Sin. What the Doctor says afterwards implying, that a Person, who is not sincerely sorry for his Transgressions, and firmly resolved to be more careful for the future to avoid them, cannot partake of the Lord's Supper without Hypocrisy and Prophaneness, is nothing at all to the Purpose; as our Author does no where say, or suppose, that a Person can partake worthily of the Lord's Supper without such a Sorrow and Resolution.

Page 89. The Doctor says, "Now after you have thus supposed the right and acceptable Discharge of this Duty to consist in these Things," (which are mentioned by the Doctor just before, and are the same, which are mentioned, Prop. XV.) "you yet suppose and affirm, that a *Christian* needs no *Preparation* for the Attainment of them." No, our Author neither supposes nor affirms, that a *Christian* needs no *Preparation* for the Attainment of these. He does indeed affirm, what the Doctor says in the next Words, "That he needs no length of Time to assure his Heart that he has them." But then the Doctor has not done fairly, not to tell his Reader, that our Author affirms this only of a *true and sincere Christian*. The Doctor goes on: "And in divers other Passages throughout your Treatise, you either directly, or by  
U necessary

## 290 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ necessary Consequence avow, that no *Christian*  
 “ can be disabled from receiving the *Sacrament*  
 “ of the Lord's Supper worthily, by any Sins,  
 “ whether of *Omission* or *Commission*, that are  
 “ previous to the *actual Celebration* of this holy  
 “ *Ordinance*.” It is true indeed our Author  
 does avow this; but then it is in Case they re-  
 ceive the Lord's Supper as *sincere Disciples* of  
 Christ in a religious Remembrance of him, Which  
 our Author teaches no Person can do, except he  
 is truly sorry for his Sins, and sincerely desirous  
 disposed, and resolved to forsake them, and amend  
 his Life. And, as I have before observed, a  
 Person *ordinarily* and *generally* cannot do this  
 without having actually abstained from Sin for  
 some Time<sup>a</sup>.

The Doctor goes on: “ Now, as I have hint-  
 “ ed before, so I here *directly* affirm, that it is  
 “ utterly impossible to make these two Supposi-  
 “ tions of your's consistent.” These two Sup-  
 positions, according to the Doctor, are, First,  
 a serious professing ourselves sincere Disciples of  
 Christ, under a Sense of our strict Obligations as  
 as such, at the Lord's Supper, in order to partake  
 of it worthily. Secondly, a Man's not once  
 questioning himself concerning these Particulars,  
 but his fully and assuredly knowing, that he is  
 neither sorry for having offended his Lord, nor  
 determined to give less Offence for the fu-  
 ture. But the latter of these is no Supposition of  
 our Author. He neither says nor supposes, that  
 a Person can receive the Lord's Supper worthily  
 without questioning himself concerning these Par-  
 ticulars. He says indeed, that a true and sincere

<sup>a</sup> See p. 238, 239.

*Christian* needs no length of Time to question himself about it, in order to be prepared to partake of the Lord's Supper worthily: But he does not say so of the professed wicked *Christian*; or, if he does, he only says, that there is a bare natural Possibility of it. Neither does he say, that a Person can receive the Lord's Supper worthily, when he fully and assuredly knows, that he is neither sorry for having offended his Lord, nor determined to give less Offence for the future; but the contrary to both these are implied in that religious Remembrance of *Christ*, which he teaches is necessary to Persons in order to their partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper.

Our Author's Suppositions are these, First, That in order to a Person's partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily, he must do it with a serious and *Christian* Frame of Mind, and a Behaviour suitable to the Design of the Institution, as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, under a Sense of his own strict Obligations as such; and the whole in a serious Remembrance of *Christ* as his Lord and Master.

Secondly, That a true and sincere *Christian* needs no length of Time to assure his Heart, that he has these Qualifications; and that a Person, who has been guilty of wilful Sins, whether of Omission or Commission, may notwithstanding receive the Lord's Supper worthily with these Qualifications, if he be truly sorry for his Sins, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to forsake them and amend his Life. And between these two Suppositions there is no Inconsistency. It is manifest, that a true and sincere *Christian*, who has a serious and *Christian* Frame of Mind, is a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, and under



der a Sense of his own strict Obligations as such, without which he is not a true and sincere *Christian*, needs no length of Time to assure his Heart, that he has these Dispositions, and that he comes to the Lord's Supper as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, resolved to eat and drink in a religious Remembrance of him. And as manifest is it, that tho' a Person has been a wilful Sinner, yet if he be truly sorry for his Sins, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to forsake them, and amend his Life, he may receive the Lord's Supper with a serious and *Christian* Frame of Mind, and a Behaviour suitable to the Design of the Institution, as a sincere Disciple of *Christ* under a Sense of his own strict Obligations as such; and do the whole in a religious Remembrance of *Christ* as his Lord and Master.

Of the Alternatives therefore mentioned in the next Paragraph of Dr. *Warren*, our Author chuses this, that a Person, who partakes of the Lord's Supper in the Manner mentioned by him in his Fifteenth Proposition, makes his *Profession* of being *Christ's Disciple* therein, in *Truth* and *Sincerity*, and in the *full* and *real* Sense of the Terms he so often uses upon the Occasion, and that, because he is a *real Penitent*, and comes to the Performance of this great *Duty* with a just *Preparation*. And yet the other Alternative, *viz.* That if such a Person makes his *Profession* of being *Christ's Disciple* in Mockery, and under a *Mask* of Religion only, whilst his *Heart* is *wickedly disposed*, and *far from God*, he partakes of the *Lord's Supper* in a Manner unworthy of the *Institution*, is so far from standing full against his whole Scheme, that it is perfectly agreeable to it. Which is to shew, that if a Person par-  
takes

takes of the Lord's Supper with a Temper and Behaviour mentioned by him, Prop. XV. he partakes of it worthily, tho' he has not spent a long Time in a previous Examination into the whole Conduct of his Life : But if a Person, does therein make his Profession of being *Christ's* Disciple in Mockery, and under a Mask of Religion only, whilst his Heart is wickedly disposed and far from God, he partakes of the Lord's Supper in a Manner unworthy of the Institution ; and that such a Person ought to be affrighted at the Words of *St. Paul*, from coming to the Lord's Supper without being better prepared\*.

The Doctor next comes to what our Author says concerning the Passage of *Justin Martyr*, which he takes notice of, in which it is said, *That they only were allowed to partake of the Eucharist, who lived as Christ commanded.* This Passage, our Author says, he thinks can mean no more, than " that professed *Christians*, who " were scandalously and notoriously immoral in " the habitual and open Conduct of their Lives, " were not permitted, before some good Signs " of Repentance appeared, to partake of this " religious Rite." This Sense the Doctor admits to be true, and then says, " But will it not " from hence follow, that it was then thought, " that Repentance was a necessary Qualification " for a worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper?" Who denies it? Not our Author in any other Place, as has been shewn ; nor in this, as will presently appear, tho' *Dr. Warren* says he does, and then proceeds to the following Words of our Author ; That " the Foundation of this Disci-

\* See p. 263.

“ pline was this, and this only, that the admit-  
 “ ting Persons to the Communion, was affirmed  
 “ to be an Acknowledgment of them as *Christi-*  
 “ *ans* fit to be received into the Company, and to  
 “ partake in the religious Offices, of such as are  
 “ really so.”

“ Now, says the Doctor, I think an Assertion  
 “ so confidently made, ought to have been sup-  
 “ ported by some kind of Proof.” And I  
 think, that if the Doctor believes this Assertion  
 to be false, as he intimates, and can bring any  
 kind of Proof that it is so, he ought to have  
 produced it; but if he can bring no kind of  
 Proof of the Falshood of it, he thinks it to be  
 false without any Reason. The Doctor goes on,  
 “ But instead of Proof you assure us, That  
 “ it was not only from the Eucharist that  
 “ such were debarred, but from all other Parts  
 “ also of the common Worship of *Christians*.”  
 This Assertion the Doctor says has no Foundation;  
 but in our Author’s own Fancy; and, to prove  
 it, he endeavours to shew, that Persons, who  
 were notoriously immoral in their Lives, after  
 they became Penitents, were admitted to some  
 other Parts of the publick Worship before they  
 were admitted to the Lord’s Supper. And from  
 this, p. 97. the Doctor makes these two Conclu-  
 sions, first, “ That all Persons, who were ex-  
 “ cluded from partaking of the *Lord’s Supper*,  
 “ were not for that Reason excluded, (as you  
 “ have taken upon you to affirm) from all other  
 “ Parts of the common Worship of *Christians*.”  
 But our Author has not affirmed, that all Per-  
 sons, who were excluded from partaking of the  
 Lord’s Supper, were *for that Reason* excluded  
 from all other Parts of the common Worship of  
*Christians*.



*Christians.* But what he affirms is, that professed *Christians*, who were scandalously and notoriously immoral in the habitual and open Conduct of their Lives, were debarred not only from the *Eucharist*, but from all other Parts also of the common Worship of *Christians*; which is different from what the Doctor says he affirms.

Secondly, the Doctor concludes, "That the Church then believed, that a greater Degree of Preparation, and fuller and more approved Signs of Penitence, were necessary for the due partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, than for any other Part of *Christian Worship*." But the Doctor must be put in Mind, that this is not the Proposition, which he was to prove, but that it is one very different from it, viz. This, That it was only from the *Eucharist*, that professed *Christians*, who were notoriously immoral in their Lives, were debarred; but not from all other Parts of the common Worship of *Christians*. Neither is this Proposition a Consequence from what the Doctor says either in his Premises or in these Conclusions. For it does not follow, that professed *Christians*, who were notoriously immoral in their Lives, were not debarred from all other Parts of the common Worship of *Christians*, as well as the Lord's Supper, before they repented and became *Penitents*, either because after they were become *Penitents*; they were admitted to more or fewer Parts of the publick Worship according to the Degrees of their Guilt, and the different Signs of their Penitence, and so at last to the Lord's Supper itself; or because the Church in *Justin Martyr's* Time believed, that a greater Degree of Preparation, and fuller and

more approved Signs of Penitence, were necessary for the due partaking of the Lord's Supper, than for any other Part of *Christian* Worship. So that what our Author says, that, "it was not only from the *Eucharist*, that such were debarred; but from all other Parts also of the common Worship of *Christians*," appears to be true for any Thing Dr. Warren has said to the contrary: And what follows from it must be true also, that professed *Christians*, who were scandalously and notoriously immoral in the open and habitual Conduct of their Lives, not to be permitted, before some good Signs of Repentance appeared, to partake of the Lord's Supper, does not appear to have arisen from any Thing peculiar to the Lord's Supper itself; for they were debarred from all other Parts also of the common Worship of *Christians*; nor from any Opinion, that such Persons could not possibly come to it with good Dispositions, and eat and drink in such a Manner as not to fall under St. Paul's Denunciations, before some good Signs of Repentance appeared by their living in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of Christ. For this is the Meaning of our Author here, and not what his Adversaries seem to apprehend, viz. From any Opinion, that professed *Christians*, who were scandalously and notoriously immoral in the habitual and open Conduct of their Lives, could not possibly come to the Lord's Supper with good Dispositions, and eat and drink in such a Manner as not to fall under St. Paul's Denunciations, while they continued wickedly disposed, and absolutely impenitent, and had not so far repented, as to be sorry for their Sins, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to amend their Lives.

All

All which our Author intends to affirm in this Place, is, that it does not appear, that in *Justin Martyr's* Time professed *Christians*, who were scandalously and notoriously immoral in the habitual and open Conduct of their Lives, were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper before some good Signs of Repentance appeared, because it was then the Opinion of the Church, that such Persons could not possibly, *and that too by a natural Possibility*, partake of the Lord's Supper worthily, with good Dispositions, with a due Sorrow for their Sins, and sincere Desires, Dispositions, and Resolutions to amend, before some good Signs of Repentance appeared, so good, as that they had lived for some considerable Time in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*; but from hence, lest, if they admitted them to the Lord's Supper before such good Signs of Repentance appeared, they should admit them to it, when they were not true Penitents, and when they would still continue afterwards to be notorious Sinners; and thereby own them publickly for Brethren, fit to be received into the Company, and to partake in the religious Offices of true *Christians*, when they were not fit to be so, owned, and thereby bring a Scandal upon the *Christian* Society. And the only Inference to be drawn from it is, that it is not necessary for Persons, who have been wilful Sinners, to be arrived at a settled and habitual Practice of Virtue before they can partake of the Lord's Supper worthily; but that if they have so far repented of their Sins, that they can partake of the Lord's Supper with such a Disposition and Behaviour, as is mentioned in Proposition XV. they may receive it worthily. But it is not to be concluded

I

from



## 298 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

from hence, that Persons can partake of the Lord's Supper worthily, while they are wickedly disposed, and while they are not sorry for their Sins, nor sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to amend.

After what has been said in Defence of this Passage of our Author, it is needless to say any Thing in particular in Answer to what Mr. Bowyer has objected to it; his Objections against it being founded upon the Supposition, that our Author here says, That it does not appear to have been the Opinion of *Christians* in *Justin Martyr's* Time, that Persons scandalously and notoriously immoral in the habitual and open Conduct of their Lives could not possibly come to the Lord's Supper worthily, while they continued impenitent and wickedly disposed. Whereas he does not affirm this; but only, that it does not appear to have been the Opinion of *Christians* at that Time, that such Persons could not come to the Lord's Supper worthily, BEFORE they had shewn such good Signs of Repentance, as were then required of them before they were admitted to it. And in this Assertion it is not implied, that professed *Christians*, who were scandalously and notoriously immoral in the habitual and open Conduct of their Lives, could possibly come to the Lord's Supper worthily, while they were impenitent and wickedly disposed. For they might be penitent and righteously disposed; they might be truly sorry for their Sins, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to amend their Lives, before they had Time to shew *those good Signs* of this Repentance, which were required of them by the primitive Church.

What

What has been already said concerning the Examination and Preparation mentioned by our Author, as necessary to go before the worthy Participation of the Lord's Supper, is sufficient to answer the Arguments brought against it by Mr. Bowyer and others. For either their Arguments prove only, that a wilful Sinner, cannot partake worthily of the Lord's Supper before he has repented; contrary to which our Author teaches nothing; but it is implied in what he teaches, that a wilful Sinner cannot partake worthily of the Lord's Supper without Repentance, so far as to be sorry for his Sins, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to mend, and *ordinarily* abstaining from all Sin for some Time: Or their Arguments prove only, that a wilful, habitual Sinner cannot partake worthily of the Lord's Supper, without a different and longer Examination and Preparation, than is prescribed by our Author. But our Author, when he mentions the Examination and Preparation necessary to go before the worthy Participation of the Lord's Supper, does not speak of wilful, habitual Sinners, but of true and sincere *Christians*. And it is not implied in any Thing, which he says, that a different and longer Examination is not requisite to a professed wicked *Christian* in order to his becoming a true and sincere *Christian*: but it is implied in what he says, that such an Examination is not *peculiar* to, nor *particularly* necessary upon the Account of the Lord's Supper; that it would have been necessary and his Duty, tho' the Lord's Supper had never been instituted, and is so at all Times, tho' he has no Design nor Opportunity of coming to the Lord's Supper. And if our Author any where says,  
that

that a wilful habitual Sinner can partake worthily of the Lord's Supper without any other Examination and Preparation, than that mentioned by him, he means only, that there is a *bare natural Possibility* for him to do so. And no Arguments brought by his Adversaries against him do prove, that there is not a *bare natural Possibility* for a wilful habitual Sinner to partake worthily of the Lord's Supper without any other Examination and Preparation, than that prescribed by our Author.

Under this Proposition our Author mentions the Sixth Chapter of *St. John*, which, he says, many have laboured to interpret of the Lord's Supper, but that it has generally been interpreted not to relate to it, and therefore as such he passes it over.

To this Dr. *Brett* objects, that this Chapter of *St. John* is to be understood of the Lord's Supper, as Mr. *Johnson* has shewn in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*.

Now the Arguments brought from Mr. *Johnson* to prove, that the Sixth Chapter of *St. John* is to be interpreted of the Eucharist, are of two Sorts; First, the Authority of the Fathers; Secondly, Reasons drawn from a Consideration of the Context itself. As to the Authority of the Fathers, in the Passages cited by Mr. *Johnson* to prove, that they interpret this Chapter of *St. John* of the Eucharist, he misunderstands the Fathers, and thinks, that by what they say in those Passages they interpret *John* the Sixth of the Eucharist, when indeed they only apply the general Doctrine taught in that Chapter to the particular Case of the Eucharist. That is, that what the Fathers say in those Passages amounts



to no more, than that the Eucharist is one Means, whereby *Christians* are caused to eat the *Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood*; not but that there are other Means, whereby they are caused to do this, and they may do it at other Times than when they receive the Lord's Supper; and that therefore it does not appear from what the Fathers say in those Passages, that they understood *Christ* to speak in this Chapter particularly of the Eucharist; but that they might understand him to deliver only a general Doctrine, that whosoever *ate his Flesh and drank his Blood* at any Time, or by any Means, had eternal Life. But whereas the Eucharist appeared to be instituted particularly as a Means to cause Persons to eat the *Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood*, the Fathers could not but speak of it as a Means to cause Persons to do this, and as a Means to cause them thereby to obtain eternal Life. This Dr. *Waterland* observes in his *Review*, Chap. vi. who doubtless understood the Fathers as well as Mr. *Johnson*; and I shall endeavour to make it appear to the Reader in those three Passages produced by Dr. *Brett*, that is, that what the Fathers say in those three Passages amounts to no more than saying, that the Eucharist is one Means to cause Persons to eat the *Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood*, and thereby obtain eternal Life.

The first Father cited is St. *Cyprian*, in his Discourse upon the Lord's Prayer on those Words, *Give us this Day our daily Bread*. The original I have set down at the Bottom of the next Page, tho' with some little Addition, which Dr. *Brett*, or Mr. *Johnson* did not think fit to produce. The Sense of which I think is plainly this,

this, as will appear to any one, who carefully considers the Original: "*The Bread of Life is Christ*: And this Bread is not every ones, but it is *ours*—*Christ* is their *Bread*, who take hold of his Body, that is, *by Faith*. But this Bread, that is, *Christ*, we pray to be given to us daily, and we have Reason to pray that it may be given to us daily, because there is Danger, lest we, who are in *Christ*, and daily receive the Eucharist for the Food of Salvation, in order that we may eat that Bread of Salvation or eternal Life, which is *Christ*, by being guilty of some grievous Sin, and for that Reason being repelled, and not suffered to communicate, to receive the Eucharist, which is a Means to receive the Bread of Life, be debarr'd the heavenly Bread, and separated from the Body of *Christ*; I say, we have great Reason to pray, that we

\* *Panis Vitæ Christus est*: Et Panis hic omnium non est, sed noster est—*Christus* eorum, qui Corpus ejus contingunt, Panis est. These Words are not quoted by Dr. *Brett*, Idem autem Panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne, qui in *Christo* sumus & Eucharistiam quotidie ad Cibus Salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstiti et non communicantes a Cælesti Pane prohibemur, a *Christi* Corpore separemur, ipso prædicante et monente: *Ego sum Panis Vitæ, qui de cælo descendi*: Si quis ederit de meo Pane, vivet in æternum. Panis autem quem ego dederò, Caro mea est pro sæculi vitâ. Quando ergo diceret in æternum vivere si quis ederit de ejus Pane, ut manifestum est eos vivere, qui Corpus ejus contingunt, et Eucharistiam jure Communicationis accipiunt, ita contra timendum est et orandum, ne, dum quis abstitens separatur a *Christi* Corpore, procul remaneat a salute, comminante ipso et dicente: *Nisi ederitis Carnem Filii Hominis et biberitis Sanguinem ejus, non habebitis Vitam in vobis*. Et ideo Panem nostrum, id est, *Christum*, dari nobis quotidie petimus, ut qui in *Christo* maneamus et vivimus, a sanctificatione ejus et corpore non recedamus. *Cypr. de Orat. Domini*, p. 209, 210. Ed. *Bened.* alias 146, 147.

" be not debarred and separated from this heaven-  
 " ly Bread, the Body of Christ, by being upon the  
 " Account of some Sin repelled from, and not suf-  
 " fered to receive the Eucharist, which is a Means  
 " of receiving this Bread; because if we are se-  
 " parated from, and do not receive this Bread,  
 " which is Christ, and of which there is great  
 " Danger, if we are repelled from the Eucharist,  
 " which is so useful a Means of our receiving  
 " this Bread, we cannot have eternal Life; for  
 " Christ himself has advertised us; I am the  
 " Bread of Life, which came down from Heaven:  
 " If any Man eats of my Bread, he shall live for  
 " ever. But the Bread, which I shall give, is  
 " my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the  
 " World. Since therefore he says, if any one  
 " eats of his Bread, he shall live for ever, as it  
 " is manifest they do live, who lay hold of his  
 " Body, that is, by Faith, and who receive the  
 " Eucharist, which is a Means to cause them to  
 " continue to have hold of his Body by Faith,  
 " with a right to communicate or receive it, as  
 " being worthy so to do, so on the contrary we  
 " ought to fear and pray, lest any falling into  
 " any grievous Sin being withheld from the Eu-  
 " charist, a Means of eating Christ's Body, upon  
 " the Account of his Sin, be separated from the  
 " Body of Christ, and so remain far from Salva-  
 " tion and perish; since Christ has threatened and  
 " said, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man,  
 " and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you,  
 " And therefore we pray that our Bread, that is,  
 " Christ, may be given us daily, without which  
 " we cannot have eternal Life, that we, who are  
 " now in and live in Christ, may continue so,  
 " and



“ and not depart from his Sanctification and  
“ Body.”

In which Passage of St. Cyprian it is very plain, that by the *Bread of Life* he means *Christ* himself, and not the *Bread in the Eucharist*; and he says, that in the Lord's Prayer we pray to God, that *this Bread* may be daily given, that is, *Christ* himself, not the *Bread in the Eucharist*: that we may always have *this Bread*, by always doing that, by which we may obtain it; that we, who are now in *Christ*, and have *this Bread*, and daily receive the Eucharist in order to preserve to us *this Bread*, as a Means to cause us to do that, whereby we may continue to have *this Bread*, may not be guilty of any Sin, for which being debarred coming to the Eucharist, which is so great a Means of preserving to us *this Bread*, we lose this *Heavenly Bread*, and are separated from the *Body of Christ*. St. Cyprian says, we pray to have *Christ* the *Bread of Life* given to us daily, because there is danger of losing it by falling into some grievous Sin, by which of itself we lose *this Bread*, and shall for it also be repelled from the Eucharist, and thereby lose the Benefit of so useful a Means of preserving to us *this Bread*. So that what St. Cyprian says here concerning the Eucharist, amounts to no more, than that the Eucharist is a Means of preserving to *Christians* the *Bread of Life*, of causing them to continue to eat the *Flesh of Christ* and drink his *Blood*, and thereby obtain eternal Life. He says not, that the *Bread of Life* is the *Bread in the Eucharist*, neither does he at all intimate, that Persons can at no Time or Place eat *this Bread*, but at the Eucharist; but all, which his Words imply with regard to the Eucharist, is, that the Eucharist

is a very useful Means to cause Persons to continue to eat *this Bread of Life*; and he mentions only this Means of continuing Persons to eat the *Bread of Life*, and this Time of doing it, because the Eucharist was particularly instituted to cause Persons to do so. And from hence I think it plain, that St. *Cyprian* does not here understand, what our Saviour spoke concerning eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood in the Sixth of St. *John*, of eating and drinking in the Holy Eucharist; and that he infers not, that he, who is justly repelled from the Holy Communion, remains far from Salvation, because Persons can eat the Flesh of *Christ*, and drink his Blood only at the Communion; but because, he, who is justly repelled from the Holy Communion, is deprived of the *Bread of Life* for that very Thing, for which he is justly repelled from the Communion; and because, by being repelled from the Communion, he is deprived of a very useful Means of continuing to eat the *Bread of Life*, and which Means if he cannot worthily make use of, he cannot effectually make use of any other Means towards obtaining the *Bread of Life*, and Salvation.

The next Father produced is *Irenaeus*; and the Passage cited from him is this; "They are all together vain, who despise the whole Economy of God, and deny the Salvation of the Flesh, and condemn its Regeneration, saying that it is not capable of Incorruption: So that, according to this Opinion, neither has the Lord redeemed us with his Blood, neither is the Cup in the Eucharist, the Communion of the Blood of *Christ*, nor the Bread, which we

X

" break

### 306 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ break, the Communion of his Body \* ” New *Irenæus* does not say one Word of *John* the sixth in this Passage, nor does he cite any Words from it any where else : But from this and other Passages Mr. *Johnson* infers, that *Irenæus* supposes, that those Promises made by our Saviour, “ that  
“ *he, who eateth this Bread, shall live for ever,*  
“ are to be applied to the due receiving the  
“ Holy Eucharist : That it is by the Eucharistical Symbols, that we have a Principle of a  
“ blessed Immortality conveyed into our Bodies,  
“ for which there is not the least Appearance  
“ of Proof from any other Text of Scripture  
“ than *John* vi.

Now if by a *Principle of a blessed Immortality*, here Mr. *Johnson* means a *material Principle*, it is evident, that this Passage of *Irenæus* does not suppose, that such a Principle is conveyed into our Bodies by the Eucharistical Symbols. For the Cup and Bread of the Eucharist may be the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* without conveying a *material Principle* of Immortality into our Bodies, as appears from what has been said concerning that Passage of *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* x. 16 ; and I doubt not, but that, if the other Passages were produced, they would as evidently appear not to suppose it likewise. If by a *Principle of a blessed Immortality being conveyed into our Bodies by the Eucharist* be meant, that the Eucharist is a Means of our obtaining an happy Immortality or Salvation, it is evident that the Eucharist was ordained to be a Means of our obtaining Salvation without having recourse to *John* vi. It appears from the very

\* Lib. v. cap. 7.



Institution of it: For the ultimate End of all God's religious Institutions is the Salvation of Mankind; he designs them to be finally Means of their obtaining that End. So that tho' it be implied in *Irenæus's* Discourses, that the Eucharist conveys to our Bodies a Principle of a blessed Immortality, or is a Means of Salvation, it does not from thence follow, that he interpreted *John* the sixth of the Eucharist, and founded this Doctrine of the Eucharist's being a Means of Salvation upon that Chapter; because it may be otherwise proved, than from *John* vi. that the Eucharist is a Means of our obtaining Salvation.

The next Father cited is *St. Ignatius*, upon whose Testimony very great Stress is laid, he being a Disciple of *St. John*; and the Words cited from him are those, where he exhorts the *Ephestians*, "To make haste together to one Place, in  
" one common Faith, in one *Jesus Christ*, breaking  
" one Loaf, which is the Medicine of Immortality, our Antidote against Death for eternal Life  
" through *Jesus Christ*." *Ad Epes.* § 20. And in another Place, speaking of those Heretics who abstain from the Eucharist, he pronounces Sentence against them in these Words: "It were better  
" for them to receive it (*viz.* the Eucharist) than  
" through it they might one Day rise again."

*Ad Smyrn.* § 7. Now what is asserted in this Passage is, as *Mr. Johnson* allows, that the Eucharist is a Means of a happy Resurrection and Immortality; but this Doctrine, he says, cannot be collected from Scripture, except *John* vi. be meant of the Eucharist. But, as I observed above, it may be collected from Scripture, that the Eucharist is a Means of a happy Resur-

308 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

rection and Immortality, tho' *Jobn vi.* be not meant of it. It may be collected from the very Institution itself, as is there shewn: But moreover, when *Christ* commanded his Disciples to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of himself, to revive and preserve in them the Remembrance of himself, it is manifest, that the Remembrance of *Christ* designed to be preserved in us by this Institution was not to be a bare Remembrance of him, and to have no Influence or Effect towards producing any good End or Purpose: But that the Remembrance of *Christ* was designed to be preserved in us, that remembering him we might think of and be sensible of the Reason of his coming into the World, and what he did and suffered there for Mankind; that he came into the World and suffered Death upon the Cross to redeem us from the Punishment of our Sins; that we might hence see the great Evil and Danger of Sin, and the Love of *Jesus* in dying to deliver us from it, if we comply with the Terms by him proposed, and the great Happiness he has promised to those, who do so; and that the Fear of suffering the eternal Punishment of Sin, if we continue in it, Gratitude towards *Jesus* for dying for us, and the Desire of obtaining the Happiness promised to those, who obey him, might move us to conform to all the Doctrines and Precepts of *Christ*, and cause us to obtain Salvation.

And thus it appears, as Dr. *Waterland* says, that what the Fathers say in these three Passages amounts to no more than saying, that the Eucharist is one Means to cause Persons to eat the *Flesh of Christ*, and drink his Blood, and thereby obtain Salvation; that is, that they do not inter-

pret the sixth Chapter of *St. John* of the Eucharist, but only apply the general Doctrine taught in that Chapter to the particular Case of the Eucharist. And *Dr. Brett*, in his *Remarks* upon the *Review*, says nothing to confute this: but only brings some Arguments from the Context to prove, that *John vi.* is to be interpreted of the Eucharist, which shall be considered presently.

*Dr. Brett* next proceeds to the Reasons drawn by *Mr. Johnson*, from the Context to prove, that *John vi.* is to be understood of eating and drinking *Christ's* Sacramental Body and Blood in the Eucharist. The Doctor mentions but one Argument for this Purpose, which, I suppose, he thinks the chief, by his mentioning that only, and saying, that it alone is convincing. The Argument is this; that whereas they, who deny *John vi.* to be meant of the Eucharist, say, that it means spiritual Actions in general, or a Belief of the Doctrine of the Gospel, and particularly of *Christ's* Death, and the Benefits of it; "if  
" our Saviour in this Chapter makes a plain Distinction, a very observable Difference between believing him and his Doctrine, and  
" the Meat, which he promises to give, and  
" which he declares afterwards to be his Flesh and Blood; then he cannot by his Flesh and  
" Blood mean believing his Doctrine, and the  
" spiritual Actions proceeding from that Faith," or the believing him and his Doctrine cannot be the Meat, which he promises to give, or his Flesh and Blood. But no one, that I know of, who denies *John vi.* to be meant of the Eucharist, says, That the Meat, which *Christ* promises to give them, and which he calls his Flesh and  
X 3 Blood,



Blood, is a Belief of him, or his Doctrine, or the spiritual Actions proceeding from that Faith. Our Author says no such Thing. He says, p. 90. that the eating the Meat promised by *Christ*, the eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood is the receiving him, by receiving his *Doctrine*, as the Food and Nourishment of the Soul, that is, by sincerely believing him and his Doctrine; but he does not say, that the believing *Christ* and his Doctrine is the Meat and Drink. Dr. *Waterland*, in his *Review* says, that to eat the Flesh of *Christ*, and drink his Blood, the Meat promised is to have a Share in the Atonement made by *Christ*; and the Belief in *Christ* is a Condition required to qualify Persons to have that Share. Now in which soever of these two Senses we understand the *Phrase to eat the Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood*, to believe in *Christ* and his Doctrine is perfectly distinct from his Flesh and Blood, the Meat promised. For if, by eating the Flesh of *Christ* and drinking his Blood, we understand with our Author, believing him, or his Doctrine, the Act of believing *Christ* or his Doctrine is distinct from the Meat promised. In the Sense of our Author the Meat promised seems to be the *Doctrines* of *Christ*; and it is plain, that the Act of believing or receiving his Doctrines is perfectly distinct from the Doctrines themselves. Tho' I rather think, that the Meat promised is *Christ* himself, which he sometimes calls himself, saying, *I am the Bread of Life*, and sometimes he calls it particularly his Flesh and Blood; and to eat and drink this Meat is to receive *Christ* by receiving or believing his Doctrine. And here it is most plain, that the Act of receiving or believing his Doctrine, whereby we receive *Christ*, is perfectly distinct

distinct from *Christ* himself, the Meat received, or eat and drank. If by eating the Flesh of *Christ* and drinking his Blood we understand, with Dr. *Waterland*, to have a Share in the Atonement made by *Christ*, it is as manifest, that, to believe in *Christ*, the Condition required to qualify Persons to have this Share, is perfectly distinct from the Act of having a Share in the Atonement, or Partaking of it. So that this Argument, which Dr. *Brett* looked upon as the chief produced by Mr. *Johnson*, and alone sufficient to prove, that *John* vi. is to be understood of eating and drinking *Christ's* Sacramental Body and Blood, or the Bread and Wine, in the Eucharist, appears to be of no Force to prove this, it being founded upon a false Supposition. I shall say nothing of the different Interpretations of the Phrase of *eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking, his Blood*, given by our Author and Dr. *Waterland*; because in which soever of the two Senses we understand that Phrase, it alters not the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, as taught by our Author.

Dr. *Brett*, in his *Remarks* upon the *Review* brings Arguments from the Context to prove, that *John* vi. is to be interpreted of the Eucharist. Some of these tend only to prove, that our Saviour himself has limited the *Universality* of his Expressions in this Chapter by these two Restrictions, that the Words regard those, who live, or have lived, since *Christ* gave his Flesh for the Life of the World; and those, whom he requires to come to and believe in him; and therefore the *Universality* of the Expressions cannot be an Argument against his speaking of the Eucharist in this Place, as Dr. *Waterland* would have

have us believe, nor that the Phrase *eating Christ's Flesh and drinking his Blood* is to be understood in the Sense of *Dr. Waterland*. But as I shall not undertake to determine, whether *Dr. Waterland* has rightly interpreted that Phrase, *to eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood*, so I shall say nothing to these Arguments; but only take Notice of those, which tend to prove in the general, that *John vi.* is to be interpreted of the Eucharist.

The first Argument of this Sort is in p. 20. and is this; Persons could not eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood, until he had given it, and it is evident, that he had not given it, when he was discoursing with them: For he says, *The Bread that I will give* (therefore it had not been yet given) *is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World*. This Flesh then could not be eaten and drunk before he had given it. We must therefore look farther to see, when this Bread, which he calls his Flesh or Body, was given to be eaten and drunk; and we can find no other Time, when he did give this Bread, but when he instituted the Eucharist. To which I answer, that we may find another Time, when *Christ* did give this Bread, than when he instituted the Eucharist, and that is the Time, when he suffered Death upon the Cross, when he actually gave his Body to be crucified. *Christ* gave his Body to be eat and drank, when he gave it for the Life of the World; those Words, *which I will give for the Life of the World*, determine the Time, when they were to expect, that he would give his Flesh or Body to be their Bread, to be eat and drank, as he here promises them. But *Christ* gave his Flesh for the Life of the World only upon the Cross, *Christ* gave his  
Flesh



Flesh for the Life of the World only, when he procured the Life of the World; by that Act, by which he obtained Pardon to Sinners and eternal Life: But he obtained this only, when he gave up his Life upon the Cross, when he submitted to suffer Death upon the Cross, and actually died there. It was by nothing else which *Christ* did, that he obtained Pardon for Sinners and eternal Life, but by dying upon the Cross, and to his Death there is the Salvation of Sinners always in Scripture particularly ascribed. Therefore upon the Cross only did *Christ* give his Flesh or Body to be Bread, to be eat and drank; his Body was not Meat, or the Bread of Life before it was crucified upon the Cross, and therefore could not before be given to be eat and drank. It is indeed said by our Adversaries, that *Christ* gave or offered his Body for the Life of the World in the Eucharist under the Symbols of of Bread and Wine, by offering Bread and Wine, as the Symbols of his Body and Blood. But it has been shewn, that *Christ* offered himself upon the Cross, and not when he instituted the Eucharist\*.

The next Argument is, p. 21. and is this; as *Christ* intended to give his Flesh for the Life of the World, and to institute the Eucharist, where he actually gave Bread and Wine to his Disciples, saying *this is my Body, this is my Blood*, in so short a Time after this Discourse concerning eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood; those Words *The Bread, that I will give*, must be interpreted of that Institution, unless it can be shewed, that our Saviour, after this Discourse with

\* See under Prop. X.

### 314 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the *Jews*, appointed any other Means, by which we should eat his Flesh or Body, and drink his Blood. To which I answer, that there will be no Necessity to interpret those Words, *The Bread, that I will give*, of the Eucharist, tho' it cannot be shewed that our Saviour after this Discourse with the *Jews* appointed another Means, by which we should eat his Flesh or Body and drink his Blood; if it can be shewed, that our Saviour at the Time of this Discourse with the *Jews* appointed another Means, by which we should eat his Flesh or Body and drink his Blood. But this he plainly did; and the Means he appointed, by which we should eat his Flesh or Body, and drink his Blood, is *coming to and believing in him*. He, that cometh to me, saith he, shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. But *coming to or believing in him* could not hinder Persons from *hungering and thirsting*, except by *coming to or believing in him* they obtained, and *eat and drank that Meat*, which he intended to give them, and by which they should live for ever; and therefore *coming to and believing in him*, was a Means of eating his Flesh or Body, and drinking his Blood, and in this Discourse declared and appointed by *Christ* to be a Means, by which Persons should eat his Flesh or Body, and drink his Blood; and then there is no Necessity to interpret those Words *The Bread, that I will give*, of the Eucharist. By the Means, by which we eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood, I understand in this Answer the very Act of eating the Flesh of *Christ* and drinking his Blood. If by the Means, by which we eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood, Dr. Brett means any Thing else, as a  
Means

*Means*, which helps or causes us to eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood; it will not follow, that those Words, *The Bread that I will give*, must be interpreted of the Eucharist, tho' our Saviour after this Discourse did not appoint any other *Means*, by which we should eat his Flesh and drink his Blood. For it does not follow, that, because the Eucharist, that is, the Receiving it, the eating Bread and drinking Wine therein, is a *Means* to help or cause Persons to eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood, it is therefore the very Act of eating and drinking them; and then neither does it follow, that by the *Bread* here our Saviour meant the *Bread* in the Eucharist, or that by *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*, he meant eating and drinking the Bread and Wine there. For if eating the Flesh of *Christ* and drinking his Blood, and eating Bread and drinking Wine in the Eucharist are not the same Act, then, by eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood, *Christ* cannot mean eating the Bread and drinking the Wine in the Eucharist. For if he does mean so, then is eating the Flesh of *Christ* and drinking his Blood, and eating the Bread and drinking the Wine in the Eucharist, the same Act; but that they are the same Act, is not a Consequence of the Eucharist's being appointed a Means to cause or help Persons to eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood.

The next Argument is, p. 22. and is this; in this Chapter our Saviour most evidently promised to give something to be eaten and drank, which had not been given to any before. And when was this given? He tells us, when he gave his Flesh for the Life of the World; for that Flesh was the Bread, which he promised to give.



### 316 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

give. And then it appears from the Institution of the Eucharist, that he gave his *Flesh* and *Blood* to be eat and drunk in that Sacrament. To which I answer, That it does not appear, that *Christ* gave his *Flesh* and *Blood* to be eat and drunk in this Sacrament, unless he gave his *Flesh* for the *Life* of the *World* in this Sacrament; for it is allowed, that he gave his *Flesh* to be eaten and drunk, which was the *Meat* he promised to give, at the same *Time*, when he gave his *Flesh* for the *Life* of the *World*: But he did not give his *Flesh* for the *Life* of the *World* in this Sacrament, as has been shewn in the Answer to the first Argument; and therefore he did not give his *Flesh* and *Blood* to be eaten and drunk in this Sacrament.

I shall now produce one Argument from the Context of *John* vi. which to me seems to prove, beyond Contradiction, that the Discourse of our Saviour there is not intended, nor is to be understood of the Eucharist. *Christ* says, *y* 15. that the *Bread*, which he will give, is his *Flesh*, which he will give for the *Life* of the *World*. That therefore, which is meant by the *Bread* or *Meat* which *Christ* said he would give, was given for the *Life* of the *World*: But the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Eucharist were not given for the *Life* of the *World*; and therefore the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Eucharist are not the *Meat* or *Bread*, intended by *Christ* in this Discourse. That only was given for the *Life* of the *World*, which, by being given, obtained or procured the *Life* of the *World*, for the *Sake* of which being given the *Life* of the *World* was granted. But it is the natural *Flesh* of *Christ* only, his natural *Body* and *Blood*, which by being given obtained the

the Life of the World, and for the sake of which being given the Life of the World was granted. It is to his natural Body and Blood's being given or offered, that the Life of the World in Scripture is constantly imputed, and not to the Bread and Wine's being given or offered in the Eucharist. Even upon the Supposition of what our Adversaries contend for, that the Bread and Wine were offered to God by *Christ*, when he instituted the Eucharist, and under them, as Symbols, were offered or given, the natural Body and Blood of *Christ*; yet it is by the natural Body and Blood of *Christ* being offered or given, for the sake of their being offered or given, that the Life of the World is obtained or granted, and not by and for the sake of the Sacramental Bread and Wine being offered or given; and therefore the natural Body and Blood of *Christ*, or his natural Flesh is that only, which is given for the Life of the World.

Therefore as it thus appears, that the Fathers did not interpret *John* vi. of the Eucharist, and that the Arguments brought from the Context to prove, that it is to be so interpreted, do not prove this, and that the contrary may be plainly proved from the Context, I conceive we may safely conclude with our Author, that this Chapter of St. *John* is not meant of the Eucharist, and that what our Saviour there said concerning eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood, is not to be understood of eating and drinking Bread and Wine as his Body and Blood in the Eucharist.

*The Sacrament of the Altar* likewise asserts, and endeavours to prove, that the sixth Chapter of St. *John* is meant of the Lord's Supper. But  
I think

### 318 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

I think what has been here said is sufficient to prove the contrary notwithstanding any Arguments brought by him. However, I cannot help taking Notice of his Answer to one Objection of our Author's against this Chapter's being intended of the Lord's Supper. He says, p. 62. "That our Author objects, that *this Discourse could not relate to a Duty, which was not then instituted, nor so much as hinted at to his Disciples.* I pray you, Reader, observe, how he begs the Question: He says, "that eating Christ's Sacramental Body and Blood was not so much as hinted at to the Disciples in this Discourse.— So that our Author's Argument runs thus, *Our Lord, in this Discourse, does not speak of eating and drinking his Sacramental Body and Blood: But why does he not? Why, because he does not so much as hint at it, i. e. he does not speak of his Sacramental Body and Blood, because he does not speak of it.* A fine Reason! O Acumen!" And I pray you, Reader, observe, how he mistakes the plain Sense of our Author. For it is most manifest, that, when our Author says, *this Discourse could not relate to a Duty, which was not then instituted, nor so much as hinted at to his Disciples,* he does not mean *not hinted at* in this Discourse, but *not hinted at* in any Discourse before this. So that the *Acumen* of this Author had certainly forsaken him, when he made this Remark upon this Passage of the *Plain Account*.

Our Author observes under this Proposition, that the Essence of this Duty consists in the Remembrance of *Christ*, or in eating Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*, or as

Memo-



Memorials of his Body and Blood; and that Faith, or a Belief in *Christ*, as sent into the World by God, is the Ground of this Remembrance. To this Dr. *Brett* objects, p. 120. that it implies, "that there is no Occasion to believe in *Christ* any farther, than the *Jews* had to believe in *Moses*, as an extraordinary Man, the Head and Founder of our Religion;" and p. 121. that, "to make the *Essence* of this holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, to consist in the Remembrance of him, and that the only Ground of this Remembrance is Faith in *Christ* as sent into the World by God, plainly implies, that nothing more is necessary with regard to the Faith, which every Communicant ought to have, than to believe, that *Christ* was a Person sent by God." To which I answer, That if Faith in *Christ* as sent into the World by God, be the Ground of that Remembrance of him, which Persons must have at the Eucharist; then that Remembrance of *Christ* must be a Remembrance of him as what he is, as being what he is in his Person, and as coming into the World for the End, for which he came, and as doing what he did there. For Faith in *Christ* as sent into the World by God necessarily implies a Belief in him as such a Person, as God sent him; as being what he is in his Person, as coming into the World for the End, for which he came, and as doing what he did there. For Persons have not Faith in *Christ*, except they believe him to be what he really is; no Person can be said to believe in *Christ*, who does not believe him to be what he is; who does not believe, what he and his Apostles taught in Scripture concerning

concerning him. *Faith in Christ as sent into the World by God* does not signify to believe no more of *Christ*, than that *he was a Person sent into the World by God*, as Dr. Brett seems to understand it ; but it signifies to believe in *Christ* as *such a Person, as God really sent into the World, when he sent Christ*. If therefore Faith in *Christ*, as sent into the World by God, be the Ground of that Remembrance of him, which Persons must have at the Eucharist, then that Remembrance must comprehend all, which is contained in that Faith. It must be a Remembrance of *Christ* as *what he really is* ; and the Faith, which every Communicant ought to have, is to believe, that *Christ* is really such a Person, as God sent into the World, when he sent him. What therefore Dr. Brett says, is a Consequence of this Observation of our Author, *viz.* that the Essence of the Lord's Supper consists in eating Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*, is not a Consequence of it.

The Doctor goes on, and says, “ But as to the  
 “ *Essence* of this Sacrament, does it indeed con-  
 “ sist only in partaking of *Bread* and *Wine* as  
 “ Memorials of *Christ's Body* and *Blood* ? Or in  
 “ *Remembrance* of his Death, and that his *Body*  
 “ was broken, and his *Blood* shed on the Cross  
 “ for our Good ? That is, his *Body* was broken,  
 “ and his *Blood* shed to testify, that he was sent  
 “ by God to teach us sound Doctrine, and to seal  
 “ that Testimony with his Blood.”

To which I answer first, That our Author does not say, that the Essence of the Lord's Supper consists in partaking of Bread and Wine in Remembrance of *Christ's* Death ; but in partaking of Bread and Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*.

Secondly,

Secondly, That our Author no where says, that in the Lord's Supper we partake of Bread and Wine, in Remembrance that *Christ's* Body was broken, and his Blood shed, *ONLY to testify that he was sent by God to teach us sound Doctrine, and to seal that Testimony with his Blood.* Yes, says the Doctor, he does; for "This is all the Good this Author has taught us to believe *Christ* has done for us." But tho' our Author mentions only this Good which *Christ* has done for us, it does not thence follow, that he has taught us to believe *Christ* has done this Good *only* for us. Was it the Design of our Author in his Book to teach us all the particular Goods, which *Christ* did for us, and did he profess to do so, and did his Subject necessarily require it, it might indeed be concluded, that he taught us to believe the *only* Good, which *Christ* has done for us, is *to testify, that he was sent by God to teach us sound Doctrine, and to seal that Testimony with his Blood,* because he mentions that Good only. But this cannot be concluded from his mentioning that Good only, when his Design is not to teach all the particular Goods, which *Christ* did for us, when he does not profess to do this, and when his Subject does not necessarily require it. On the contrary, by our Author's saying in the General, that we are to partake of the Bread and Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*, is implied, that this Remembrance is a Remembrance of him, as what he really is, as accomplishing the Ends he came into the World for, and obtaining all those Goods for Mankind, which he did really obtain, whether by his Life or Death. We cannot have a right Remembrance of *Christ*, and it is a right

Y



### 322 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Remembrance our Author intends, without calling to Mind who, and how great a Person he was, who died for us, what was the Cause of his coming into the World, living here some Years, and then dying for us, as is acknowledged by Dr. Brett, p. 123. And to that Question of the Doctor's, how comes the Redemption of Mankind, which was the Chief, not to say the only Reason, for which *Christ* laid down his Life, not to be so much as mentioned, or hinted at in his whole Book? I answer, because it is not the professed Design of his Book to teach the Reasons for which *Christ* laid down his Life, nor does the Subject of it require them to be all particularly mentioned.

XVII. It is an Employment very proper, and very agreeable to this *Institution*, to revive in our Minds, upon this Occasion, the Force of all those Arguments upon which we believe in *Christ*; to own ourselves *his* Disciples; to confess, and heartily condemn, all our Deviations from *his* Laws and Precepts; to acknowledge before God our Obligations to live as his Disciples, who expect to be happy upon *his* Terms only; to express our sincere Thankfulness for his Doctrine, Example, Life, and Death; to profess our Dependence upon *Him*, as our only *Head*; and lastly, to revive and enlarge our affectionate Union and Sympathy, with all other Members of the same Body throughout the World.

To this Proposition Dr. Brett objects first; Why is it not as proper to remember the Cause of his Life and Death? To which I answer, That the Remembrance of the Cause of his Life and Death is implied in this Proposition. It is here

here said, that we should express our sincere Thankfulness for his Life and Death. But we cannot have, nor by Consequence express a sincere Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ*, except we have that which is the only Grounds of Thankfulness for it. Now the only Grounds of Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ* is a Sense and Memory of the Benefits which we receive by his Life and Death. So that we cannot express a sincere Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ*, except we have a Sense and Memory of the Benefits, which we receive by his Death. Therefore in expressing our sincere Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ* is implied the Remembrance of the Benefits, which we receive by his Life and Death; and in these Benefits is included the Cause of his Life and Death. Again, we cannot express a sincere Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ*, such a Thankfulness as will be acceptable to God, and such a Thankfulness our Author doubtless means in this Proposition, without remembring his Life and Death to be, what they really are, to have been for the Ends, for which they really were; and in these Ends is included the Cause of his Life and Death. And that in expressing a sincere Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ* is implied a Thankfulness, and by Consequence a Remembrance, of the Cause of his Life and Death, is implied in that Question of Dr. Brett, p. 123. *do not all these Things, that is, the Things which he had mentioned, as the Cause of the Life and Death of Christ, appertain to the Thankfulness we ought to express on this Occasion?* Now if the Cause of the Life and Death of *Christ* appertain

324 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

to the Thankfulness we ought to express upon receiving the Lord's Supper, we ought then to be thankful for the Cause of his Life and Death; and if we ought to be thankful for it, we must remember it, otherwise we cannot be thankful for it; and when our Author says, that we should express our sincere Thankfulness for the Life and Death of *Christ*, he plainly signifies, that we should do all, which appertains to that Thankfulness.

The Doctor goes on, and says, "Why is it only proper for us barely to profess our Dependence upon *him*, as our only Head? Is he not our Lord and our God, our Creator and Redeemer, and ought we not to profess our Dependence upon him as such?" To which I answer, That our Author does not say in this Proposition, that we are *only* barely to profess our Dependence upon him as our only Head; we are indeed to do this with other Things, but not this only. For he says, That we are to own ourselves his Disciples, which implies a Professing our Dependence upon him in every Relation, in which he stands to us. To own ourselves his Disciples is to own or profess that we believe *Christ* to be what he is. For if we do not believe *Christ* to be what he is, we do not believe what *Christ* and his Apostles taught concerning himself; and if we do not believe this, we cannot be his Disciples. And if we believe *Christ* to be what he is, then we must believe him to bear all those Relations to us, which he really bears to us, and that we have Dependence upon him in all those several Relations; and therefore to own ourselves to be *Christ's* Disciples, is to own or profess our Dependence upon him, or that we have a Dependence upon



upon him, in every Relation, in which he stands to us, and so in all those Relations mentioned by Dr. Brett, supposing that *Christ* does bear all those Relations to us. And lest I should by any one be misunderstood in adding this Supposition, as our Author has been in some Cases, and be thought, that by adding it I would insinuate or teach, that *Christ* does not bear those Relations to us, I plainly tell them, that I have no such Intention; but I add it, because the Subject I am upon does not require me to mention or reach particularly all the Relations, which *Christ* bears to us, but only to speak of them in the General.

But says the Doctor, "though this Author has thus diminished the Dignity, the Honour, and the infinite Majesty of *Christ*, by representing him only as a Lawgiver, and Head, or Chief of a Society, who receive him as such;" in which Manner our Author does not represent *Christ* in this Proposition, or any where else, as appears from what has been just now said; "yet even the Remembrance, as such, is not by him thought to be necessary. It is only very proper and very agreeable to the Institution; it may be done without Offence, but if it be not done, it is not very material." But our Author does plainly say, that the Remembrance of *Christ* is necessary at the Lord's Supper in his Observation just before this Proposition, and in several other Places, and not only that it is very proper and agreeable to the Institution: And what in this Proposition he says is very proper and agreeable to the Institution is, that we revive in our Minds the Force of all those Arguments, upon which we believe in *Christ*, and the rest; to revive in our Minds these Things, so as to en-

### 326 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

large upon them; for a Time to employ, and let our Thoughts dwell upon them; which is a Thing different from the Remembrance of *Christ*. Every Time we partake of the Lord's Supper, we must remember *Christ*, and rightly remember him as what he really is; this is necessary to the due Performance of this Duty: But it is not necessary, that we should always enlarge upon all the Particulars of *Christ's* Character every Time we perform it, nor upon all the Particulars mentioned in this Proposition. It is very proper, and very agreeable to the Institution to do this; but not absolutely necessary to the due Performance of it. The Remembrance of *Christ* essential to the Performance of this Duty, is the calling to Mind, who, and how great a Person he was, who died for us, what was the Cause of his coming into the World, living here some Years, and then dying for us; and these Things will necessarily come into a Person's Mind, who rightly believes in *Christ*, upon his seriously remembering him; but it is not absolutely necessary for a Person to enlarge upon these. This Remembrance implies also a Belief of all the Particulars mentioned in this Proposition; that a Person has this Belief habitually: But it does not necessarily require him actually to think of, or employ his Thoughts upon them every Time he partakes of the Lord's Supper. It is very proper for him to do so, and agreeable to this Institution, if, during his Attendance upon it, he has Time: But it is not absolutely necessary; so that, if he has not Time thus to employ his Thoughts, this Duty may be duly performed without it.

And as our Author thus appears to think the Remembrance of *Christ* to be necessary to the  
due

due Reception of the Lord's Supper, and therefore to be far from thinking it *not very material*; so upon Examination he will be found to think those Things, which he mentions, Prop. XVII. as very proper and agreeable to this Institution, to be, tho' not absolutely necessary to the due Performance of it, yet very material, and of ill Consequence to be omitted, when there is Time to do them; and not to think or say, that they are not material, and that to omit them can have no ill Consequence, as Dr. Brett represents him to do. For immediately after Prop. XVII. he says, "That tho' the Performance of this *one Duty* in a Manner not *unworthy* of it, or *unsuitable* to it, be the *great Point* to be necessarily regarded, at the very Time of our Attendance upon this *Holy Institution*," that is, that we perform it in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*; yet the Nature of the Duty "directs the Mind of a *Christian* to many Thoughts," — among which Thoughts are included those mentioned in Prop. XVII. "which, tho' not absolutely necessary to the Performance of the Duty, are of the greatest Importance to himself;" and therefore certainly very material to be had; for a Person to revive them in his Mind, if he has Time so to do. And why these Thoughts are of the greatest Importance to *Christians* he tells us is, because they are such, as that by directing his Mind to them the Lord's Supper proves, by its own Tendency and good Effect upon him, a *Means* leading to his own great Increase in all that is worthy of a Man and a *Christian*. And therefore it may be of very ill Consequence to omit the reviving of those Thoughts, when there is Time for it; because



it may hinder the Lord's Supper from having that good Effect upon, and doing a Person that Benefit, which it is designed for, and tends to, and is capable of doing.

Neither is it a Consequence of our Author's Doctrine, as Dr. *Brett* says it is, pag. 123.

" That if two or three, or more good honest  
 " Fellows meet together, and in a serious Man-  
 " ner, enough to distinguish it from a common  
 " Meal, shall sit down together, and break and  
 " eat Bread and drink Wine, saying, *Remember*  
 " *Christ's Death, and partake of this Bread and*  
 " *Wine, as Memorials of his Body and Blood,* or  
 " Words to the like Effect, they do all that is  
 " *essential* to the Celebration of this Sacrament."

I say, this is not a Consequence of our Author's Doctrine, if by it be meant, as it seems to be, that it is not necessary to the Celebration of this Sacrament, that the Bread and Wine be set apart, and appointed to be the Memorials of *Christ's* Body and Blood by a Priest. For it is not the Design of our Author in his Book to teach what is necessary to be done in order to the due Celebration of the Lord's Supper by any Person besides the People; but only what the People are to do, when the Bread and Wine are distributed to them. It is his Design to shew what is the *Essence*, the Nature and Design of this Institution with regard to the People; and what they are to do in order to their duly receiving it. And with regard to them he teaches, That the *Essence* and Nature of the Lord's Supper consists in eating Bread and drinking Wine, as the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, in a serious and religious Remembrance of him; and that the End and Design of it with regard

to

to them is, to preserve in them the Remembrance of *Christ*. It is all along supposed, that all, which is necessary towards the due Celebration of the Lord's Supper to be done by any Person besides the People, is done; and he teaches, that the People are to eat the Bread and drink the Wine, not thinking that they eat Bread and drink Wine, which have been offered in Sacrifice to God, but that they eat Bread and drink Wine set apart and appointed to be the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, in Obedience to the Command of *Christ* to do so, in order to preserve in them the Remembrance of him, and that they have at the same Time a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*.

Dr. Brett, p. 128. proceeds to an Argument before used to shew, that the Essence of the Lord's Supper cannot consist in eating Bread and drinking Wine in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*; which is, that St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* do not add the Precept, *Do this in Remembrance of Me*; and he thinks it strange they should record only what is least essential, and omit that which is most so. To which Argument having given an Answer under the Eighth Proposition, I shall only add here, That to eat the Bread and drink the Wine are as essential to the Lord's Supper, as the Remembrance of *Christ* is; and therefore St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*, though they do not mention that Remembrance, yet do not record only what is least essential, and omit that which is most so. And though, as the Doctor says, p. 131. " the  
" Essence of an *Institution* consists not so much  
" in the Command, as in the Thing command-  
" ed, and that they are distinct the one from the  
" other ; "

“other ;” yet the Nature and End of an Institution, or one of them, or Part of them, may be learnt from the Command to do it ; if either the Nature, or the End, or one of them, be expressed in that Command, as they are in the Case before us. For in this Command in the Words of the Institution of the Lord’s Supper, *This do in Remembrance of me*, is expressed one Part of the Nature of this Institution, *viz.* the Remembrance of *Christ* ; the other Parts, *viz.* to eat Bread and drink Wine, were mentioned before. And in this Command likewise is signified, what is the End of this Institution, That it is to preserve in Men the Remembrance of *Christ*. For there are no other Words besides this Command in the Words of the Institution, from which the End of the Lord’s Supper can be learnt ; and these can teach nothing else to be the End of it, but to preserve in Men the Remembrance of *Christ*. For to say, *This do*, thus eat Bread and drink Wine, in Remembrance of me, cannot lead Persons to think, that they are so to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of *Christ* for any other End, than to preserve in them the Remembrance of *Christ*, if *Remembrance* respects the Memory of Men, as I have shewn it does ; that to preserve the Remembrance of *Christ* is the *primary* and *immediate* End of this Institution ; not but that there are other Ends served by it through this Remembrance, and to effect which this Remembrance naturally tends.

Pag. 131, 132. Dr. Brett says, That the Essence of this Sacrifice consists not, as our Author pretends, barely in partaking of Bread and Wine in Remembrance of *Christ* ; but likewise in offering



fering them in the same Manner he did, and for this a Priest is necessary ; he also blames our Author for saying, that the Bread and Wine are not to be offered in Sacrifice to God upon an Altar, and that the Bread and Wine are not to be blessed, that is, *by praying to God over them* ; though τὸ προσφέρει must signify *offer this*, or be a Tautology, and St. Paul plainly says, we *Christians* have an *Altar*, and calls the Cup *the Cup of Blessing, which we bless*. To all which Arguments I have already given a sufficient Answer, and shewn, that none of them can prove, that the Bread and Wine are to be offered as a material Sacrifice ; and therefore a Priest is not necessary in order so to offer them, nor to the due Administration of this Sacrament upon that Account.

Pag. 133. The Doctor reprehends our Author for taking the Liberty he does with Scripture ; and says, " Let a Man but take the Liberty to do, as this Author does, that is, to cast off a Text as obscure and unintelligible, when he cannot expound it so as to make it agreeable to his own pre-conceived Opinions, or add what Words he pleases to make it agree with his Opinion, and he may prove from Scripture whatever he has a Mind to." To which we may answer, Let a Man take the Liberty to do, as Dr. Brett and the Advocates for his Side of the Question do, that is, take an obscure and ambiguous Text of Scripture, and expound it in such a Sense as is agreeable to their own pre-conceived Opinions, and make a plain Text, which is directly contrary to their Opinion, appear obscure and ambiguous, and then interpret it in that Sense, which is agreeable to their Opinion,

nion, and he may prove from Scripture, whatever he has a Mind to. The Texts called obscure by our Author are undeniably so, as are all those likewise, which are brought by his Adversaries to confute him; and the only plain Texts of Scripture, which plainly declare the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, and from which our Author deduces the Nature and End of it, *viz.* the Words of the Institution of this Holy Rite, as recorded by the Evangelists, particularly *St. Luke* and *St. Paul*, they make ambiguous and obscure by bringing at best but very weak Reasons to shew them to be capable of a Sense, and that the Sense of them is, different from that Sense which they naturally and obviously bear.

The Essence of a Thing is, as the Doctor says, "that, which constitutes its Being, and  
 "when we have the Essence of any Thing, we  
 "have all, that is necessary for us to have of  
 "it;" and agreeable to this, after all is done, which is necessary to be done by any Person, besides the People, in order to the due Celebration of the Lord's Supper, then, if they being sincere *Christians* eat and drink the Bread and Wine in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*, they have all, which it is necessary for them to have of the Lord's Supper, do all which is necessary for them to do towards the due Celebration of the Lord's Supper, which is what our Author means, when he says, that the Essence of the Lord's Supper consists in eating Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*. But it does not from hence follow, as the Doctor insinuates, that, if a Company of Men meet together, who are not sincere *Christians*, as they cannot be, if they are without Repentance, and eat  
 I Bread

Bread and drink Wine, saying, *I do this in Remembrance of Christ*, or but think of him in their Hearts, that they do all which is essential towards the due Celebration of the Lord's Supper, when all is not done, which is necessary to be done towards the due Celebration of the Lord's Supper before the Bread and Wine are distributed to the People.

Dr. Brett goes on, " But we say, that in a Divine Institution, whatever is instituted or appointed to be done, belongs to the Essence of it." Which no one denies. The Doctor goes on; " Now *Christ* did not say, *Partake of Bread and Wine as Memorials of my Body and Blood*; as if that was all, that was to be done: " But he said, *do or offer this in Remembrance of me.*" But we have before shewn, that *Christ* did not say, *offer this in Remembrance of me.* Neither did *Christ*, when he instituted the Lord's Supper, give the Bread and Wine for his Disciples, or for all Mankind, as the Doctor says. For if he then gave the Bread and Wine for his Disciples, or for all Mankind, he gave them for the Remission of their Sins, as he himself expressly says. But the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper were not given for the Remission of the Sins of Men; no, not after they were appointed to be the Signs and Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*. For it was *Christ's* real and natural Body and Blood, which were given for the Remission of the Sins of Men. And even these were not given for the Remission of Sins, when *Christ* instituted the Lord's Supper; but when he suffered Death upon the Cross<sup>a</sup>. The Body and Blood of

<sup>a</sup> See p. 312.



### 334 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Christ* were given for the Remission of Sins at the Time, when they obtained that Remission by actually redeeming Men from the Punishment of their Sins. But they did not actually redeem Men until he suffered Death upon the Cross; and therefore then only were they given for the Remission of Sins. And thus in Scripture it is to the Death of *Christ*, that the Redemption of Mankind, and the Remission of Sins, is constantly ascribed, and not to his giving, or offering Bread and Wine, as the Signs or Representations of his Body and Blood, when he instituted the Lord's Supper. And for this Reason it appears, that our Saviour must be understood, as using the Present Time for the Future, when at the Institution of the Lord's Supper he says, *This is my Body given or broken for you; This is my Blood shed for you and for many for the Remission of Sins*; because the Body and Blood of *Christ*, which were given, broken, and shed for the Remission of Sins, were not given, broken and shed, when *Christ* instituted the Eucharist.

Pag. 136. Dr. Brett says, " Did *Christ* solemnly take *Bread* and *Wine*, offer the Bread " or give it to God for them," — which it has been shewn he did not do, — " and call it his " Body, pour out, or make a Libation or Drink-offering of the *Wine*," — where, by the way, we must observe, that it does not appear from the Words of the Institution, or any other Passage of Scripture, that *Christ* poured out the Wine, or made a Libation or Drink-offering of it, as the Doctor says; but that he took the Cup, which had Wine already in it, — " and called it " his *Blood shed for the Remission of Sins*, and " mean nothing by it, but only that hereafter, " when

“ when he was gone from them, they should  
 “ eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of  
 “ Him? — and yet designed no Benefit to  
 “ them thereby?” No, we are not to think,  
 that *Christ* instituted the Lord's Supper in the  
 manner he did without designing any Benefit to  
 Men thereby; nor do I know any Person, who  
 says so. Our Author does not say so, but, far  
 otherwise. He says, That it was designed to be,  
 and really is very beneficial to Men; as it tends  
 to lead their Thoughts, and consequently their  
 Practice, to all that is good; as the due par-  
 taking of it tends to procure us the present Fa-  
 vour of God; as it is the Means, which natu-  
 rally leads to such Dispositions and *Christian*  
 Graces, as entitle us finally to his Favour in  
 Heaven; and which, amongst other Means,  
 helps to render us fit for all such Assistances, as  
 are proper for him to give to free and reasonable  
 Creatures. Pag. 138, 139.

In the latter Part of this Paragraph the Doctor  
 reprehends our Author for changing the Word  
*Testament*, in the Words of the Institution, into  
*Covenant*, and says, that in this Place the origi-  
 Word, *διαθήκη*, must signify *Testament*, “ because  
 “ that, which *Christ* here gave his Disciples re-  
 “ ceived its Virtue and Efficacy from his Death,  
 “ that, which he gave, was, he tells us, *his*  
 “ *Blood shed for many*, the Virtue and Efficacy  
 “ of which was the *Remission of Sins*,” and  
 therefore it must be a *Testament*, that is, as I un-  
 derstand it, a *Will*, by which something is given  
 by one Person to another to come to him after  
 the Death of the Giver, because it has the Na-  
 ture of a *Testament*, which receives its Virtue,  
 Efficacy, or Force from the Death of the Testa-  
 tor.

### 336 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

tor. For a Testament is of Force after Men are dead; otherwise it is of no Strength at all, while the Testator liveth. Heb. ix. 17. Now, not to dispute here, whether the Wine in the Eucharist, or the natural Blood of *Christ* only, receives the Virtue, Efficacy, or Force of the Remission of Sins by the Death of *Christ*, the former of which the Doctor seems to insinuate, though the latter is most certain, it does not follow, that the Blood of *Christ* is a Testament or Will, because it receives its Virtue, Efficacy, or Force from the Death of *Christ*, as well as a Testament or Will does from the Death of the Testator, unless it receive its Virtue, Efficacy, or Force in the same Manner. But the Blood of *Christ* does not receive its Virtue, Efficacy, or Force of Remission of Sins from the Death of *Christ* in the same Manner, in which a Testament or Will receives its Force from the Death of the Testator. The Blood of *Christ* receives its Virtue, Efficacy, or Force of the Remission of Sins from the Death of *Christ*, as his Death is the Price of that Virtue, Efficacy or Force; that, by which it was purchased; for the sake of which, as the meritorious Cause, God was pleased to grant to his Blood the Virtue, Efficacy, or Force of the Remission of Sins. But a Testament or Will does not receive its Force from the Death of the Testator, as his Death is the Price of that Force; that, by which it was purchased; for the sake of which, as the meritorious Cause, that Force was given to it; But because the Death of the Testator is the Time appointed for it to receive its Force, so as to give Persons a Right to the Things bequeathed to them therein.

Moreover,



Moreover, the Meaning of the Words of the Institution is not, that either the *natural Blood of Christ*, or the *Wine* in the Eucharist, is itself the *New Testament* or *Covenant*; but that the *Wine* in the Eucharist is the *Sign* or *Memorial* of the *New* or *Gospel Covenant* \*. And though the Gospel Covenant does receive all its Force from the Death of *Christ*, this is not a Proof, that it is a *Testament* or *Will*, unless the Death of *Christ* cannot be necessary to give Force to the Gospel Covenant, except it be a *Testament* or *Will*. But such is the Nature of the Gospel Covenant, that the Death of *Christ* is necessary to give Force to it, though it be not a *Testament* or *Will*. The Gospel Covenant is this, That God agrees to grant to Men Remission of Sins and eternal Life upon their Repentance and Amendment for the Sake of the Death of *Christ*, if he will lay down his Life for them. Where it is plain, that this Covenant receives all its Force from the Death of *Christ*, so as to be of no Force without his Death, and that the Death of *Christ* was necessary to give Force to it, though it be not a *Testament* or *Will*. Besides, the Gospel Covenant does not receive its Force from the Death of *Christ* in the same Manner, in which a *Testament* or *Will* receives its Force from the Death of the Testator. The Gospel Covenant receives its Force from the Death of *Christ*, as his Death is the Price of it; that by which it was purchased; for the Sake of which, as the meritorious Cause, God was pleased to make that Covenant with Men. But a *Testament* or *Will* does not receive its Force from the Death of the Testator, as his

\* See under Prop. VIII. and farther under this.

### 338 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Death is the Price of it; that, for the sake of which, as the meritorious Cause, he was pleased to make his *Testament* or *Will*; but in the Manner above mentioned, when speaking of the Force of the Blood of *Christ*. Neither has the Gospel any Thing in it of the Nature of a *Testament* or *Will*. And therefore our Author did very right in changing the Word *Testament* in the Words of the Institution for the Word *Covenant*, which is less ambiguous, and less liable to be misunderstood.

And that Passage of St. Paul, *Heb. ix. 17.* would be much more suitable to the Drift of the Apostle's Discourse in that Chapter, if *διαθήκη* was translated *Covenant*, and *διαθέμενος* not *Testator*, which there is no Necessity for it to signify, but the *Covenant-maker*, him, who makes the Covenant, by interposing between the Parties covenanting, or the *Satisfier*, him, who makes the Satisfaction, for the sake of which the Covenant is made, than it is in the present Translation. And the Word *διαθέμενος* will very well bear either of these Senses. For if *διατίθημι* signifies to *appease*, or *satisfy* Persons, that they may enter into some Agreement or Covenant with others, as it is used by *Appian, De bello civ. Lib. 2.* then *διαθήκη* may signify a Covenant made by Means or Interposition of some Thing or Person to *appease* or *satisfy*, and then *διαθέμενος* may signify him, who makes the Covenant, or him or that, which makes the Satisfaction, for the sake of which the Covenant is made. Let us therefore put the *Covenant-maker* or the *Satisfier* instead of the *Testator*, and see how the Sense will run then. I shall take the latter, and then the Sense of the Apostle from *ψ 15*, is this;

15. *And*

15. *And for this Cause, because he hath shed his Blood for Mankind, he is the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by Means of his Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions, to redeem Men from the Punishment of them by satisfying God for them, that were under the first Covenant, they, which are called, might receive the Promise of eternal Inheritance.*

16. *For where a Covenant is, which is made for the Sake of Men's Sins being satisfied for to God by the Death of some Person, as the New Covenant is, there must of Necessity be the Death of the Satisfier, of him, who by his Death makes the Satisfaction, for the Sake of which the Covenant is made.*

17. *For a Covenant, made for the Sake of Satisfaction made by the Death of some Person or Persons, is of Force ἐν ὑποστάσει in their being dead, for the Sake of whose Death it is made: Otherwise it is of no Strength at all whilst the Satisfier liveth, he, who by his Death makes the Satisfaction, for the Sake of which the Covenant is made.*

18. *Whereupon, as a Covenant, made for the Sake of the Death of another, is of no Force until after the Death of that Person or Creature, for the Sake of whose Death it is made, neither the first Covenant was confirmed, had its Force, for so ἵκανον will signify, without Blood, without the Blood of the Creature being shed, and its being put to Death, for the Sake of the Death of which the Covenant was made.*

*To keep thus to the Notion of a Covenant, and not run off to that of a Testament or Will, is most agreeable to the Scope of the Apostle here, and makes his Sense most natural and easy;*



### 340 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

whereas the other breaks and interrupts the Sense. Perhaps the Sense of the Apostle here may be made plainer by the following Observation. As Men are Sinners against God, there can be no Covenant between God and Men, whereby God agrees to accept and receive them into his Favour, except their Sins are remitted; but the Apostle says, *120* *20. that without shedding of Blood, that is, without Death, there is no Remission.* So there can be no Covenant between God and Man without the Death of some Creature or Person, in which the Covenant is founded; and in the very Idea of a Covenant between God and Man there is included the Death of some Creature or Person, by which his Wrath against Sin is appeased, and for the Sake of which he is pleased to make the Covenant. Taking therefore the Word Covenant to include this, the Sense of this Passage runs thus;

16. *For where a Covenant is, there must also of Necessity be the Death of the Satisfier, of him, whose Death is to appease God, and for the Sake of which he is pleased to make the Covenant.*

17. *For a Covenant is of Force in their being dead, whose Death was to appease God in order to the Covenant's being made: Otherwise it is of no Strength at all, whilst the Satisfier liveth.*

18. *Whereupon, as a Covenant is of Force after he is dead, whose Death is to appease God in order to its being made, but not before, neither the first Covenant was confirmed or received its Force without Blood, without the Death, which was to appease God in order to its being made.*

And hence it appears, that, when Christ calls the Wine the Sign of his Blood of the New Covenant,

venant, or the Sign of the New Covenant in his Blood, his Meaning is, This Wine is the Sign of my Blood, in which Blood the New Covenant is founded, for the Sake of which it is made; or this Wine is the Sign of the New Covenant founded in my Blood, made for the Sake of my Blood.

Pag. 138. Dr. Brett says, " And that the  
 " Church of *England* — believes the sixth  
 " Chapter of *St. John* to relate to the *Eucharist*,  
 " is plain, for it is upon the Authority of that  
 " Chapter only, that she can say in her Exhor-  
 " tation to her Communicants, that, *If with a*  
 " *true penitent Heart and lively Faith, we receive*  
 " *that Holy Sacrament, then we spiritually eat*  
 " *the Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood, then*  
 " *we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are*  
 " *one with Christ and Christ with us*: For  
 " there is no other Place of Scripture but the  
 " sixth Chapter of *St. John's Gospel* where  
 " this Doctrine is to be learnt." To which I  
 answer, That the Church by saying, in her  
 Exhortation at the Communion, that *If with a*  
*true penitent Heart and lively Faith we receive*  
*that Holy Sacrament, then we spiritually eat the*  
*Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood*, does not  
 shew, that she believes the sixth Chapter of  
*St. John* to relate to the *Eucharist* in such  
 Sense, as that it was spoken and intended  
 particularly of the *Eucharist*; that by eating  
 the *Flesh of Christ*, and drinking his *Blood* in  
 that Chapter, was meant eating the Bread and  
 drinking the Wine in the Lord's Supper, so  
 that Persons could at no Time eat the *Flesh of*  
*Christ* and drink his *Blood*, but when they re-  
 ceived the Lord's Supper: But in that Exhortation

### 342 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the Church only applies the general Doctrine taught in that Chapter to the particular Case of the Lord's Supper, as that was particularly appointed to be a Means to cause Persons to eat the Flesh of *Christ* and drink his Blood; and which Persons certainly did, when they received the Lord's Supper, if they received it *worthily*, tho' they might do it at other Times as well as then.

To eat the Flesh of *Christ* and to drink his Blood, or to take and receive *Christ*, or his Body and Blood, seems to be *actually* to exercise a true and sincere Belief or Faith in *Christ*, as to eat and drink our bodily Food, or to take and receive it, is to chew it in our Mouths and swallow it down. And we are afterwards nourished by this spiritual Food, the Body and Blood of *Christ*: as that Faith influences our Practice, so as to bring it to a Conformity to the Laws of *Christ*, as our bodily Food nourishes us after we have eat and drank it, by being dispersed through the material Body. And by continuing often to eat the Body and Blood of *Christ* our Souls are continued to be nourished thereby, and caused to grow up unto eternal Life; as by continuing often to eat and drink our bodily Food, our Bodies are continued to be nourished thereby, and caused to grow up to that State, to which they are designed to arrive.

If it should be said, that it cannot be imagined, that so great a Promise as that of eternal Life, should be annexed to the single Act of *actually* exercising a true and sincere Faith, or Belief in *Christ*, and therefore this cannot be the Sense of those Words, *To eat the Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood*: I answer, That when *Christ* says,



says, *Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood*, meaning thereby, whoso exercises a true and sincere Faith or Belief in me, *hath eternal Life*, he does not mean, whoso once *actually* exercises a true and sincere Faith or Belief in me, and then thinks no more about me, hath eternal Life; but whoso *actually* exercises a true and sincere Faith or Belief in me so often, as to be influenced thereby sincerely to conform to my whole Doctrine. This is agreeable to the Manner of speaking with regard to bodily eating and drinking, from whence this Figure of spiritual eating and drinking is taken. If a Person was to say to any one, If you eat Beef and Mutton, and drink Ale, you will not starve, no one would understand him to mean, that if he eat and drunk them but once, he would not starve; but if he eat and drunk them so often, as was sufficient to satisfy his Hunger and Thirst, and to nourish and support his Body. So when *Christ* says, If ye eat my Flesh and drink my Blood, or *actually* exercise a true and sincere Faith, or Belief in me, ye have eternal Life, he does not mean, that, If ye do this but once, ye have eternal Life; but if ye eat my Flesh and drink my Blood so often as is sufficient to satisfy your Hunger and Thirst after Righteousness, to nourish and support the Soul in the sincere Practice of my Laws, that is, of Righteousness and true Holiness, which is the Health and Strength of the Soul.

Moreover, in this Exhortation the Church appears to mean by *spiritually eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking his Blood*, believing in *Christ*. By *eating the Flesh of Christ and drink-*

*ing his Blood*, here she doubtless means the same as by *feeding upon Christ* in the Words which the Minister is to say, when he delivers the Bread to the People. Now by *feeding upon Christ* there she means *believing in him*. The Words are *and feed on him in thine Heart by Faith*, in which it is declared, that it is by Faith, by believing in *Christ*, that we feed upon him. The Words import not, that *Faith* or *Believing* is the Means of our feeding upon *Christ*; but that the Act of Faith or Believing is the Act of feeding; that believing in *Christ* is feeding upon him. This seems to be the plain natural Sense of the Words, and not only, that Faith is the Means of our feeding upon *Christ*; which is farther confirmed from the Words *in thy Heart*. The *Heart* here signifies the Mind or Understanding, and by its being said *feed on him in thy Heart*, is implied, that the Act of feeding is to be performed in the Heart or Mind; but the Act of feeding can be no otherwise performed in the Mind, than by exercising some Act of the Mind; and then to perform that Act of the Mind is to perform the Act of feeding, and so the Act of feeding is an Act of the Mind; and what Act it is, is plainly declared by the Addition of the Word *Faith*; that it is Faith or Believing in *Christ*; and therefore the Act of believing in *Christ* is the Act of feeding upon him.

If it should be said, that in the XXVIIIth Article the Church says, that *the Mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Lord's Supper* is Faith; and that therefore it cannot be the Sense of the Church, that the Act of Faith is the Act of eating; but that it is as different from it, as the Means made use of, to obtain any End is different from the End: I answer, That

That there is no Necessity to understand the Church in this *Article* in so strict and philosophical a Sense, as to intend by *Mean* that which helps, assists and causes us to eat the Body of *Christ*; but she may well be understood to intend, that the Act of Faith is the Act of eating, and not different from it. And this Sense the Church expresses very justly and properly by saying, that the *Mean* whereby we eat the Body of the Lord is *Faith*. Was a Person asked by what *Mean* he eat his bodily Food, he would naturally answer by chewing it in his Mouth and swallowing it down, and in so saying would give a just and proper Answer; and yet the Act of chewing the Food in his Mouth and swallowing it down, is the Act of eating it, tho' it be said to be the *Mean*, whereby he eats it. If therefore, when a Person declares by what *Mean* he eats his Bodily Food, he says it is by chewing it in his Mouth and swallowing it down, and expresses himself justly and properly in so saying, tho' he intends to signify, that the *Mean* of eating his Bodily Food, and the Act of chewing it in his Mouth and swallowing it down, are the same, and is so understood by all; the Church also, when she declares the *Mean*, whereby Persons eat the Body of *Christ* in the Lord's Supper, and that it is *Faith*, expresses herself justly and properly in so saying, tho' she intends to signify, that the *Mean* of eating the Body of *Christ* and the Act of Faith are the same, and may be so understood by all. The Figurative Expression of *spiritually eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking his Blood* is taken from *bodily eating and drinking*. And the best Way to know the Sense of any Expressions concerning spiritual eating and drinking



drinking is to consider, what would be the most natural and proper Sense of them, if spoken of bodily eating and drinking. Whatever any Expressions naturally and properly signify, when spoken of bodily eating and drinking, the same will they naturally and properly signify, when spoken of spiritual eating and drinking. If therefore, when a Person says, that the *Mean*, whereby he eats his bodily Food, is chewing it in his Mouth and swallowing it down, that Expression naturally and properly signifies, that the *Mean* of eating, or the Act of chewing and swallowing the Food down and the Act of eating are the same; then, when the Church says, that the *Mean*, whereby Persons eat the Body of *Christ* in the Lord's Supper, is *Faith*, that Expression naturally and properly signifies, that the *Mean* of eating or the Act of Faith and the Act of eating are the same. And as it thus appears, that the Church may be justly and properly understood in this Sense in the *Article*; so is this Sense of the *Article* confirmed by this Passage in the Communion Service, by which it plainly appears, to be the Sense of the Church, that the Act of Faith or Believing, is the Act of eating and drinking, as has been shewn.

And that by *spiritually eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking his Blood*, the Church means *Believing in Christ*, and not *eating the Bread and drinking the Wine* in the Lord's Supper, is manifest from the *Rubrick* after the *Communion of the Sick*, which is this: *But if a Man, either by Reason of extremity of Sickness, or for want of Warning in due Time to the Curate, or for lack of Company to receive with him, or by any other just Impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate shall instruct*  
him

him, that if he do truly repent him of his Sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered Death upon the Cross for him, and shed his Blood for his Redemption, earnestly remembering the Benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty Thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his Soul's Health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his Mouth. Now the Church here plainly declares it to be her Sense, that a Person may spiritually eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, tho' he does not eat and drink the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and by Consequence that it is her Sense, that spiritually to eat the Flesh or Body of Christ and drink his Blood is not to eat the Bread and drink the Wine in the Lord's Supper. And in the actual Exercise of a true and sincere Faith in Christ is included that Repentance for Sins, that Belief in the Death of Christ, that Remembrance of the Benefits of it, and Thankfulness for it, by which the Church declares Persons do spiritually eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ; for if thereby they eat and drink them profitably to their Souls Health, they do certainly spiritually eat and drink them. From all which I cannot but conclude it to be the Sense of the Church, that *spiritually eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood, is believing in Christ.*

And as by eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood, in this Exhortation the Church appears to mean believing in Christ; so it is most probable, that by *taking and receiving the Body and Blood of Christ* in the Answer in the Catechism to that Question, *What is the inward Part or Thing signified in the Lord's Supper?* she means believing in Christ, that the Act of believing is  
the

# 348 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the Act of *taking and receiving*. As by feeding upon *Christ*, or by eating his *Flesh* and drinking his *Blood* the Church appears to mean doing this by Faith, believing in *Christ*, and that the Act of believing is the Act of eating and drinking; so it is most probable, that by *taking and receiving the Body and Blood of Christ*, she means taking and receiving them by Faith, believing in *Christ*, and that the Act of believing is the Act of *taking and receiving*; that as *the outward Part or Sign of the Lord's Supper, the Bread and Wine* are received by orally eating and drinking them, so *the inward Part or Thing signified, the Body and Blood of Christ*, are taken and received by eating and drinking them by Faith.

Under this Proposition our Author interprets some Parts of our *Communion Office*, p. 96. He says, "The *Communion Office*—begins with "Sentences relating chiefly to the Duty of Beneficence to all Men, by our *Alms* and charitable Contributions. It proceeds to the Charity and Assistance of our united *Prayers*, for the good and Happiness of the whole Body of *Christians*. After this follows an *Exhortation*, &c." To this the *Sacrament of the Altar* objects, p. 68. "I pray you, Reader, observe, here is no Notice taken of the Priest being enjoined to offer on God's Table Bread and Wine, and then to beseech God to accept those *Oblations*, or Offerings of Bread and Wine. Is not this a wilful Misrepresentation of our Communion Office." To which I answer, No. But to say, That the Priest is enjoined to offer on God's Table Bread and Wine, and then to beseech God to accept those *Oblations* or Offerings of Bread and Wine,



Wine, is a Misrepresentation of our Communion Office, as I have shewn under Prop. X. Whether wilful or not, I shall not pretend to determine.

Page 77. the same Author objects to our Author's Interpretation of the Words used by the Priest at the Delivery of the Bread and Wine to the Communicants. In which Words our Author interprets the Body and Blood of *Christ* to signify his *real Body* and *Blood* offered upon the Cross, and not the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Lord's Supper. To this the *Sacrament of the Altar* objects, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in these Words signify the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Lord's Supper. To prove it he has these Words: "I  
 " desire the Reader to observe, whether the plain  
 " natural Construction of the Words do not run  
 " thus: *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,*  
 " *which was given* (just now representatively  
 " given, or offered to God) *for thee, preserve*  
 " *thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life.* He  
 " takes the *representative Body* of *Christ* into his  
 " Hand, and holds it *to and before* God, and  
 " prays that it may *preserve* the Communicants  
 " *Body and Soul unto everlasting Life,* by convey-  
 " ing to him the Grace and Power of the Spirit,  
 " to enable him to observe the Terms of the  
 " Covenant, and so to obtain everlasting Life.  
 " The same, *mutatis mutandis,* may be said of  
 " the Cup, the *Representative Blood* of *Christ.*"

Now here is only a bare Assertion, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* signify the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Lord's Supper, but no Reason to prove, that they do so signify. And in reply I shall offer a Reason or two to shew, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in these Words do not signify the

350 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Lord's Supper, but the *real Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*.

First, The *Bread* and *Wine* in the Lord's Supper, as I have often before observed, were not *given* or *shed* for Mankind, either at the Institution of the Lord's Supper, or at any other Time; and therefore cannot be said to be the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* *given* and *shed* for us, for whom only the *real Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* were *given* and *shed* <sup>a</sup>.

Secondly, The plain natural Sense of the Words import, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* signify, not the *Bread* and *Wine*, but the *real Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. The Words, *which was given for thee*, and *which was shed for thee*, most naturally import something, not *just now* given and shed, but which was given and shed some Distance of Time *before*. Besides, if the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* signify the *Bread* and *Wine*, the same Thing, which the Priest holds in his Hand, when he says these Words, and afterwards delivers to the Communicants, the Word *IT* ought *properly* to have been used, and not *THIS*, and the Sense of the Words would have run thus; *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was just now given for thee, and which I here have in my Hand, preserve thy Body and Soul unto eternal Life, take and eat it in Remembrance, that Christ died for thee, &c.* But the Word *THIS* being used of the *Bread*, which the Priest holds in his Hand, and delivers to the Communicant, plainly implies, that *that Bread* was something distinct from the *Body* of *Christ* before spoken of. The same may be said of the *Wine*, *mutatis mutandis*.

<sup>a</sup> See p. 337.

What this Author farther says in his Objections to our Author's Interpretations of several Parts of the *Communion Office*, to shew, that our Church teaches the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper to be different from what our Author teaches them to be, is sufficiently answered by what has been said in other Places of my Book.

XVIII. Whether any *Privileges*, or *Benefits*, are annexed to the partaking *worthily* of the *Lord's Supper*; and what they are that are annexed to it, can appear only from the *Words* of the *New Testament* itself; or from the real *Nature* and *End* of this *Institution*, and what is necessarily included in it.

Under this Proposition our Author mentions that Passage of *St. Paul*, *1 Cor. xii. 13.* *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit*, and brings Arguments to prove, that it does not relate to the Lord's Supper. The *Sacrament of the Altar* makes an Attempt to confute our Author in this Point. But as he does not insist upon it, that this Passage relates to the Lord's Supper, I shall take no Notice of what is said upon it; but refer the Reader to what our Author says, and to the several Comments upon this Passage, which he may meet with for his Satisfaction in this Point.

The *Privileges* and *Benefits*, which our Author says appear to be annexed to the partaking of the Lord's Supper *worthily*, are, *First*, Such as are common to that with other religious Services; *Secondly*, Such as it is more particularly the Design and Tendency of that to confer.

Of



### 352 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Of the first Sort is all that Favour and Acceptance with God, which are plainly promised and annexed to our assembling ourselves in Obedience and in Honour to Him and his Authority.

Of the second Sort is, That the Lord's Supper leads our Thoughts, and consequently our Practice, to all that is good, and to all that is necessary for us to ask of God, and to act ourselves towards our Advancement in it. So that our Attendance upon this Rite is not only the paying a religious Service in the Way appointed by *Christ*; which cannot but be always favourably accepted by God: But it is a doing that, which we ourselves can see to tend naturally to revive and keep alive in our Minds all such Thoughts, and Dispositions and Tendencies, as are proper to work upon the Conduct of our whole Lives. So that the Partaking of it is a Means to procure us the present Favour of God; and to entitle us finally to his Favour in Heaven; and to render us fit for all such Assistances as are proper for him to give to free and reasonable Creatures. And thus, according to our Author, the Lord's Supper is a Means of our partaking of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death; but not *physically*, by conveying them to us by the very Act of eating the Bread and drinking the Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*; but *morally*, as it tends to cause us so to believe in *Christ*, repent of our Sins, and amend our Lives, as God has made the Conditions of our receiving the Benefits of *Christ's* Death.

To this Proposition Dr. Brett objects no otherwise, than by objecting to some Observations made by our Author after it, though I apprehend the Design of these Objections is to prove,

prove, that the Lord's Supper is an actual Partaking of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by the very Act of eating the Bread, and drinking the Wine, in Remembrance of *Christ*.

First, our Author says, " If we review all the Passages of the New Testament, which I have before produced [and they are all, which can be thought to relate to this Rite] we shall find there is only *one* of them, which has been supposed by *Interpreters*, to imply in it any immediate *Benefit* or *Privilege* annexed to the Partaking of this Rite, viz. that of St. *Paul*, in which the Partaking of the *Cup*, and of the *Bread* at the Lord's Table, is said to be the *Communion* of the *Blood* and of the *Body* of *Christ*. This Passage, has, by many, been interpreted to signify an actual Partaking of all the Benefits of his Sufferings and Death for our Sakes. But I have already shewn at some Length, that the *Apostle's* Argument in that Place, and his plain Intention in it, neither require, nor admit this Sense of the Words." And I have moreover shewn, that the *Communion* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, may signify to have the Benefits of *Christ's* Death communicated to us by the Lord's Supper, very consistently with the *Apostle's* Argument, and Intention in that Place; and yet, not signify to have them communicated to us by the very Act of eating the Bread, and drinking the Wine, in Remembrance of *Christ*; but as by doing that, they are communicated, and conveyed, in the Sense of our Author just before-mentioned.

To this Dr. *Brett* answers, that besides this Passage here mentioned, he has shewn, that what *Christ* says, concerning eating his *Flesh*, and drinking

drinking his Blood, in the sixth Chapter of *St. John*, teaches also, that great Benefits are annexed to the Lord's Supper. To which I reply, that I have shewn, that the Dr. has not proved what is said in that Chapter, to be meant of the Lord's Supper; and moreover, that the Discourse of *Christ* there, is not to be understood of the Lord's Supper.

Dr. *Brett* next proceeds to take notice of the pernicious Consequence our Author seems afraid of from the Doctrine, that all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are annexed to the very Act of Partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper, which is, "That it may lead *Christians* to think, that  
 " this, or any one single Instance of Obedience  
 " to the Will of God, however worthily performed, and suitable to its Nature and End,  
 " could possibly be to them the Partaking of all  
 " the Benefits of *Christ's* Life and Death." To this the Dr. says, " But does not this Gentleman  
 " know, that they, who believe that such great  
 " Benefits are annexed to the worthy Participation of this Holy Sacrament, do not esteem it  
 " to be but one Instance of Obedience to the  
 " Will of God? They teach, that no Man can  
 " worthily receive this Holy Sacrament, but he,  
 " who is obedient to the Will of God in all  
 " Things." Mr. *Bowyer* makes the same Objection, Page 82.

But tho' they do teach, that no Man can worthily receive this Holy Sacrament, but he, who is obedient to the Will of God in all Things; yet it does not from thence follow, that they do not esteem the worthy Participation of this Holy Sacrament to be but one Instance of Obedience to the Will of God. For, Obedience to other  
 Duties,



Duties, may be required in a Person to qualify him to perform worthily another Duty, and yet that other Duty be but one Duty, and the Performance of it, but one Instance of Obedience to the Will of God. Thus, Prayer, is but one Instance of Obedience to the Will of God; and yet, in order to a Person's praying worthily, his Obedience to other Duties is required, *viz.* those of being sincerely sorry for his Sins, and sincerely disposed, and resolved to amend. So, tho' in order to a Person's partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily, his Obedience to the Will of God in all Things, or to all other Duties be required, yet is the receiving the Lord's Supper worthily, but one Instance of Obedience to the Will of God. This, perhaps, may be farther illustrated thus: Suppose a Person has lived in a sincere Obedience to the Will of God in all Things, for some Years [tho' a Person may be a worthy Partaker of the Lord's Supper, if he has not lived so long in a sincere Obedience to the Will of God] such a Person may certainly partake worthily of the Lord's Supper; yet, when he partakes of that, he obeys but in one Instance, performs but one Duty, one Act of Obedience. Such a Person is a true Penitent, is just, is charitable; but when he partakes worthily of the Lord's Supper, he does not perform the Duties of Repentance, Justice and Charity; he is, indeed, *intentionally* a Penitent, just and charitable, but he does not then actually practise and perform these Duties; but one entirely different from it, *viz.* that of eating Bread, and drinking Wine, in Remembrance of *Christ*. For it must be observed, as what is undoubtedly true, that tho' it be very proper and agreeable to this Institution,

### 356 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

stitution, actually to exercise Acts of Repentance, by confessing, and heartily condemning all our Deviations from God's Laws and Precepts, and Acts of Charity, and of several other Duties; nay, I will say, not only proper and agreeable to this Institution, but also the Duty of Persons, who come to it, to perform some other Duties, particularly those mentioned in the Seventeenth Proposition of our Author, if during the Time of their whole Attendance upon this Rite, they have Time for it, as the Custom of the Church of *England* often allows them; yet the Partaking of the Lord's Supper, consists only in the very Act of eating Bread, and drinking Wine, in Remembrance of *Christ*: But it does not consist, nor any Part of it, in the actual Performance of any other Duty, except the actual Performance of that Duty be included in that Remembrance; neither is it absolutely necessary to the due Performance of this Rite.

Dr. *Brett* goes on, " They do not teach, as  
 " this Author does, that he is a worthy Receiver,  
 " who, without Repentance and Amendment of  
 " Life, presumes to partake of it, notwithstanding  
 " ing they appear, and be very serious and de-  
 " vout, all the Time they attend at the Lord's  
 " Table, and never so plainly distinguish it from  
 " a common Meal." Our Author no where  
 teaches, that a Person can be a worthy Receiver  
 of the Lord's Supper, without Repentance, mean-  
 ing by Repentance, an hearty and sincere Sor-  
 row for Sin, and a sincere Disposition and Re-  
 solution to forsake it, and amend his Life; but  
 the contrary. For he teaches, that no Person  
 can worthily receive it, who is not a sincere *Chris-  
 tian*, whose Thoughts and Temper of Mind are  
 incon-

inconsistent with this Holy Rite, or with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time. But no Person is a sincere *Christian*, and has Thoughts, and a Temper of Mind, consistent with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time, who is not heartily and sincerely sorry for his Sins, and sincerely disposed and resolved to forsake them, and amend his Life. And as a Person must be a sincere *Christian*, and have Thoughts, and a Temper of Mind, consistent with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time before he can worthily receive the Lord's Supper; so is it necessary for him, before he can worthily receive it, to do all, which is necessary to make him a sincere *Christian*, and to have Thoughts, and a Temper of Mind, consistent with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time. But then it is necessary for him to do this at all Times, and not only when he is coming to the Lord's Supper, and would have been equally necessary for him, tho' the Lord's Supper had never been instituted. So that this is not *peculiar* to the Lord's Supper; and therefore not necessary to be *particularly* spoken of, and insisted upon, by a Person, treating only of what is *peculiar* to, and *particularly* belongs to the Lord's Supper, as our Author is in his Book. He supposes a Person to be, what a *Christian* ought to be, in all other Respects, and teaches what he is *particularly* to do, in order to partake worthily of the Lord's Supper, and according to the Nature and Design of it. And according to this Supposition, neither does our Author teach, that a Person is a worthy Receiver of the Lord's Supper, without Amendment of Life.

But if our Author says any Thing which is thought to imply, that a Person may be a wor-



### 358 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

thy Receiver of the Lord's Supper without Amendment of Life, it is only in the Case where a Person continues a wilful Sinner, until the Time of his coming to the Lord's Supper; and then comes so truly sorry for his past Sins, and so sincerely disposed, and resolved to amend, as that he does afterwards act agreeably to that Resolution. And I think no one can deny either that such a Person is a worthy Receiver of the Lord's Supper, or that it is possible for a Person, who is a wilful Sinner until the Time of his coming to the Lord's Supper, then to become thus truly sorry for his past Sins, and sincerely disposed and resolved to amend. This, I say, is *naturally* possible, tho' very improbable, if not *morally* impossible; and it can be no Encouragement to any, who know themselves to be wilful Sinners, to come to the Lord's Supper without Repentance and Amendment of Life, because it is barely possible for them in so short a Time, as while they are attending upon that Rite, to become so truly sorry for their Sins past, and sincerely disposed and resolved to amend, as to continue afterwards to act agreeably to that Resolution, and be worthy Receivers. Much less can it be any Encouragement to such Persons to come so to the Lord's Supper, when by some Instances of coming so they have experienced, that they cannot in so short a Time become so truly sorry for their past Sins, and sincerely disposed and resolved to amend, as to continue afterwards to act agreeably to that Resolution; but that more Time, Care, and Pains, are requisite, in order to their Amendment of Life. After

they know this by Experience, if they do not take more Time, Care, and Pains, to reform their Lives, they cannot come to the Lord's Supper with a sincere Disposition and Resolution to amend, which our Author says are absolutely necessary to their partaking of it worthily, they being implied, as he says, Page 128. in our professing ourselves *Christians*, and remembering *Christ* as our Lord and Master at his Table; which he likewise teaches are necessary to the worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper. For whoever does less than he knows to be necessary towards his Amendment, is certainly not sincerely disposed and resolved to amend.

The Doctor goes on, and says, " I confess indeed, a Man may be such a worthy Receiver, as this Author describes, without receiving any Benefit from this Sacrament, on the contrary he will render himself liable to God's greater Anger for his Presumption." But I deny, that a Person can be such a worthy Partaker of the Lord's Supper, as our Author describes, without receiving any Benefit from this Sacrament. For such a Person cannot partake of the Lord's Supper without being led to, and having such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions revived, and kept alive in him, as tend to confirm him in, and without which he cannot perform that universal Obedience, which alone can entitle him to the Promises of *Christ*. And this certainly is a great Benefit. And that such a worthy Receiver, as our Author describes, cannot partake of the Lord's Supper without receiving this Benefit, I think is manifest. For a worthy Receiver in the Sense of our Author, is a sincere Believer in *Christ*, who partakes of the

360 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Communion in Remembrance of *Christ*, as his Master, and professes himself his Servant and Disciple ; in consequence of which he must be sensible of the Necessity of a Christian Behaviour, and of an universal Obedience to his Master, and be sincerely disposed towards, and resolved to amend, Pag. 75, 128. of the *Plain Account*. But sincerely to believe in *Christ*, to own him for his Lord and Master, to have a Sense of the Necessity of an universal Obedience to his Master, and to be sincerely disposed and resolved to amend, are certainly such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions, as tend to confirm a Person in, and without which he cannot perform that universal Obedience, which alone can entitle him to the Promises of *Christ* ; and all these are implied in that Remembrance of *Christ*, which it is necessary for a Person to have when he partakes of the Lord's Supper that he may partake of it worthily. And if so seriously to remember *Christ*, and so particularly to call him to Mind, as Persons must do, when they worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, preserves and keeps alive in them the Remembrance of *Christ*, as it certainly does, it must also lead them to, revive, preserve, and keep alive in them, all those Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions, which are implied in that Remembrance. If Persons have not those Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions before their coming to the Lord's Supper, then does that Remembrance beget them in them ; if they have not particularly exercised them before their coming to the Lord's Supper, but have them intentionally and habitually, then does that Remembrance revive them ; if they have particularly exercised them just before their coming to the

the



the Lord's Supper, then does that Remembrance preserve and keep them alive.

Neither will such a worthy Receiver, as our Author describes, render himself liable to God's greater Anger for his Presumption. If after receiving the Lord's Supper he always and constantly acts suitably to the Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions, which he then had, he certainly will not become liable to God's greater Anger; but if he be afterwards a wilful habitual Sinner, he will most certainly be condemned for that Disobedience, and his receiving the Lord's Supper will aggravate his Guilt, and consequently his Condemnation. But not because he received it unworthily, which he did not do; but because it hath a Tendency in its Nature and Design to continue him good, or make him better; which Tendency he wilfully neglects and resists.

But suppose it possible that a Man may be such a worthy Receiver, as our Author describes, without receiving any Benefit from the Lord's Supper, I mean *naturally* possible, for *morally* possible I cannot think it to be; it does not from thence follow either that such a worthy Receiver can never receive any Benefit from the Lord's Supper, or that there is no Benefit annexed to partaking of it. For tho' a Person does at one Time receive no Benefit from the Lord's Supper, because he neglects or resists the Tendency it has to make him reform his Vices, and increase in Virtue; yet he may at other Times receive Benefit from it, when, according to its natural Tendency, it helps him to reform his Vices, and increase in Virtue. And though there be no Benefits annexed to, or to be received from the  
 Lord's

Lord's Supper, when Persons are wanting to themselves in neglecting or resisting the Tendency it has to cause them to obey the whole Will of God, yet there may be Benefits annexed to, and to be received by partaking of it, when Persons are not wanting to themselves in neglecting or resisting the Tendency it has to cause them to obey the whole Will of God, but yield to and comply with that Tendency; which Benefits are its helping them in their voluntary and sincere Endeavours of reforming all their Vices, and increasing in all Virtue.

And as it appears that such a worthy Receiver, as our Author describes, may receive Benefit by partaking of the Lord's Supper; so I affirm, that such a worthy Receiver as the Doctor describes, cannot receive those Benefits by partaking of the Lord's Supper, which he says Persons do receive by worthily partaking of it. Such a worthy Receiver as the Doctor describes is one, who sincerely believes in *Christ*, has repented of all his Sins, and amended his Life; and the Benefits which he says are to be received, by worthily partaking of the Lord's Supper, are all the Benefits of *Christ's* coming into the World. Now a Person who sincerely believes in *Christ*, has repented of all his Sins, and amended his Life, has, at the very instant that he sincerely believes in *Christ*, has repented of all his Sins, and amended his Life, all the Benefits of *Christ's* coming into the World; he then receives, and is in Possession of them, as far as he can receive them in this World, and so cannot receive them by partaking of the Lord's Supper, because he had before received them, and was in Possession of them, when he came to the Lord's Supper, and

and when he was partaking of it, or eating the Bread and drinking the Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*. For a Person cannot receive that which he is already in Possession of, and has already received, until he has been deprived of it, which is not the Case of the Person we are speaking of. A Person cannot receive that by the Performance of any Action, which he has received, and is in Possession of before he performs that Action, and which he is not deprived of from the Time that he received, and was in possession of it, to the Time of his performing that Action, nor then neither, which is the Case of such a Person, as we are speaking of. Therefore such a worthy Receiver, as the Doctor describes, cannot receive those Benefits by partaking of the Lord's Supper, which he says Persons do receive by worthily partaking of it.

The Doctor goes on, Page 141, "The Church, I mean the true primitive Catholic and Apostolic Church, which always believed that the *Benefit Christ* purchased for us by the breaking of his Body, and shedding of his Blood, were annexed to the receiving this Holy Sacrament *worthily*, has also taught, that none could receive it *worthily*, but such as lived soberly, righteously, and godly; and who, as far as the Infirmities of human Nature permitted, were entirely obedient to the whole Will of God, not obedient in one Instance only, as this Gentleman would suggest." But though Persons cannot worthily receive the Lord's Supper without being entirely obedient to the whole Will of God, and not obedient in one Instance only; yet the receiving the Lord's Supper, which consists in eating Bread and drinking

Wine



Wine in Remembrance of *Christ*, (for then do Persons receive the Lord's Supper, when they eat the Bread and drink the Wine, and not 'till then,) yet this Act, I say, is but one Instance of Obedience, is to be obedient in one Instance only, as our Author asserts. Tho' Persons cannot worthily receive the Lord's Supper without being obedient to the whole Will of God. It does not thence follow, that the receiving the Lord's Supper worthily consists in being obedient to the whole Will of God. To receive the Lord's Supper worthily, manifestly does not consist in being obedient to, or in obeying the whole Will of God, but in being obedient, or in obeying only in that one Instance of eating Bread and drinking Wine, in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*.

The Doctor goes on to this Effect, "Our Church has provided Exhortations to be read to all her Members before the Administration of the Holy Communion, wherein she exhorts them to consider the Dignity of that holy Mystery, and the great Peril of the unworthy receiving thereof, and so to search and examine their own Consciences, that they may come holy and clean to such an heavenly Feast. And then directs them to reconcile themselves to both God and their Neighbour, and to repent them of their Sins, or else not come to that Holy Table. And does all this amount to no more than one single Instance of Obedience to the Will of God?" No, it is very manifest to all, that, to examine their own Consciences, to reconcile themselves to God and their Neighbour, and to repent them of their Sins, are more than one single Instance of Obedience to the Will of God, are several Instances of Obedience to it; but then it is no less manifest that the

the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper does not consist in examining their own Consciences, in reconciling themselves to God and their Neighbour, and in repenting them of their Sins; but in eating Bread and drinking Wine in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*, which is but one single Instance of Obedience still.

" This Author, however, says the Doctor, " Page 143, endeavours to prove, there are no " Benefits annexed to the worthy receiving this " Sacrament, and says, — " It will appear " plainly by one Instance, and that shall be the " Benefit of the Remission of our past Sins thro' " *Jesus Christ*. If it be asked, Do we not partake of this Benefit by partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily? I must answer No, if the Gospel be true. For in that no Pardon of past Sins is promised or given, unless to those just converted, renouncing their Sins, and baptized into the Christian Faith; or to those, who having sinned after Baptism, actually amend their Lives." — " But I have shewed, " says the Doctor, that actual Amendment of " Life is a necessary Preparation for the worthy " partaking of the Lord's Supper, and therefore " this Instance can be of no Service to his " Cause." In Answer to which I observe, *First*, That our Author no where endeavours to prove, that there are no Benefits annexed to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper. On the contrary he teaches, that there are Benefits annexed to the worthy receiving of it, and what they are has been above shewn. *Secondly*, If this Instance can be of no Service to our Author's Cause; yet what the Doctor says to shew, that it can be of no Service to his Cause, *viz.* that actual Amendment is a necessary Preparation for our worthily par-

### 366 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

partaking of the Lord's Supper, can be of no Service to the Doctor's Cause, to prove that Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion are received by worthily partaking of the Lord's Supper. For suppose that actual Amendment of Life is a necessary Preparation for worthily partaking of the Lord's Supper; yet as soon as a Person has actually amended his Life he receives Remission of Sins before he partakes of the Lord's Supper, and then cannot receive Remission of Sins by partaking of the Lord's Supper, as has been above shewed of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Passion<sup>a</sup>. And supposing that a Person can worthily partake of the Lord's Supper without actual Amendment of Life, if he does only *bewail his own Sinfulness, and confess himself to Almighty God, with full Purpose of Amendment of Life*, as it is expressed by our Church in her Exhortation before the Communion Service; then as partaking of the Lord's Supper is not actual Amendment of Life, and as actual Amendment of Life is necessary towards a Person's receiving Remission of Sins, a Person cannot receive Remission of Sins by partaking of the Lord's Supper. For he has not that Qualification, which is absolutely necessary towards his receiving Remission of Sins, neither does he obtain that Qualification by partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper. And no one can prove that a Person cannot partake worthily of the Lord's Supper without actual Amendment of Life, if he does only *bewail his own Sinfulness, and confess himself to Almighty God, with full Purpose of Amendment of Life*, and our Church in the Ex-

<sup>a</sup> See Pag. 363.

hortation,



hortation, of which these Words are a Part, plainly teaches he can.

The Doctor goes on, Pag. 145. but says this Author, "In our public Office it is not supposed, that the worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper does itself operate this Forgiveness: but it is made Part of a Prayer to God, that they who have partaken of it, may obtain Remission of their Sins, and all other Benefits, &c. They are taught to pray thus after the Act of Communion is over; which supposes that it is not already obtained." — "But, says the Doctor, I can see no such Consequence to be drawn from this Prayer, that, because the Church appoints it to be said after we have actually received the Holy Communion, therefore she supposes Remission of Sins, and the other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion are not obtained by our partaking of the Lord's Supper, if we have received it worthily. For although the Remission of Sins be obtained by partaking of the Holy Eucharist, when we receive it worthily; yet considering the Defects and Infirmities of the very best of Men, we have Reason to fear, lest we may not receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, not through an Insufficiency in the Sacrament, but through some Defect in ourselves." By our receiving the Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Death, by partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper, must be meant our receiving them in such a Manner, as it is possible for us to receive them in this World. But if we have actually received the Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Death by partaking of the Communion, or have actually received them, when we do partake

### 368 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

take of it; for that we cannot receive them by partaking of the Communion I have already shewn; it must be absurd and improper to pray in this Prayer, that we may receive that Remission, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Death. For it is absurd and improper to pray, that we may receive that which we have already received. And though the Defects and Infirmities of Men be never so great, yet we can have no Reason from them to fear lest we may not receive those Benefits of *Christ's* Death, which we have actually received, nor can there be any Reason to pray, that we may receive them. There is Danger, indeed, thro' the Defects and Infirmities of Men of their losing these Benefits, which they have received, and Reason for them to pray that they may not lose them; and supposing that Persons have actually received these Benefits when they partake of the Lord's Supper, the Sense of this Prayer must be, that they may not lose them, but continue in the Possession of them; and not that they may actually receive them, which is absurd and impossible. And to preserve Persons from losing, and continue them in the Possession of these Benefits after they have received them, is one Benefit which our Author says is annexed to the worthy Partaking of the Lord's Supper, as it leads and helps them to such Thoughts and Resolutions as may confirm them in that universal Obedience, which alone can continue them in the Possession of those Benefits. But if it be insisted on that the Sense of this Prayer is, that we may actually receive Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Death, the plain Consequence of that is, that this Prayer supposes that Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Death

Death, are not received, when we partake worthily of the Lord's Supper, unless we will make it an absurd and unreasonable Prayer. Yet, as it is certain, that Persons may be sometimes, if they are not always, actual Partakers of the Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, as far as they can receive them in this World, when they receive the Lord's Supper worthily, I take the Sense of this Prayer to be, that we may not lose, but continue in the Possession of these Benefits; unless the Sense of it be, that they may obtain Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, not so far as they can obtain them in this Life, but that they may finally obtain them in Heaven: Which, after all, may perhaps be the true Sense of it. And then it is certain, both that this Prayer supposes, that Persons have not yet so received those Benefits, and that this Supposition is true.

The Doctor goes on, Page 146. "Why should the Church appoint this Prayer to be said only at this Time, just after receiving this Holy Sacrament, and at no other Time whatsoever, if she did not suppose Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion are to be obtained by it?" To which Question I answer, in the Words of the Doctor, that it is a certain Token, that she believes Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion are annexed to the worthy receiving of this Sacrament, because, immediately upon the receiving it, she requires such a Petition to be made. But it does not appear, because the Church requires such a Petition to be made immediately after receiving this Sacrament, that she believes these Benefits are annexed to the worthy receiving it,



so as that they are to be obtained by the very Act of receiving it. For she may not believe, that they are in that manner annexed to the worthy receiving it; but that Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion are so annexed to the worthy receiving this Sacrament, as the worthy receiving it leads and helps Persons to such Thoughts and Resolutions, as will confirm them in that universal Obedience, which alone can intitle them to those Benefits; and yet, with great Reason and Propriety, appoint that Prayer to be said just after the receiving this Holy Sacrament.

The Doctor goes on, " And he may as well  
 " say, that when a Man receives a Medicine for  
 " his Health, and, after he has taken it, prays  
 " to God to restore him to his Health, that  
 " therefore he does not expect that Benefit from  
 " any Virtue God has given to such a Medicine,  
 " as to say, that the Church does not suppose  
 " Remission of Sin is to be obtained by receiv-  
 " ing the Holy Communion, because, immedi-  
 " ately after our receiving it, she orders us to  
 " pray, that we may obtain Remission of Sins." But this Comparison makes not at all for the Doctor's Cause. For tho' a Person by praying to God to restore him to his Health, after he has taken a Medicine for his Health, shews, that he expects that Benefit from some Virtue God has given to that Medicine; yet he does not shew, that he believes he has actually received that Benefit, when he makes that Prayer, or that he expects to receive the Benefit by the very Act of taking the Medicine. So, tho' the Church, by ordering us to pray, that we may obtain Remission of Sins, immediately after our receiving the Communion,

Communion, shews, that she supposes Remission of Sins is to be obtained by receiving the Holy Communion; yet she does not thereby shew, that she supposes Remission of Sins is obtained at the Time she orders that Prayer to be made, or that Remission of Sins is to be obtained by the very Act of Receiving the Holy Communion. It is absurd for a Person to pray, that he may receive his Health, at a Time, when he believes he has received it, and for the Church to order Persons to pray, that they may receive Remission of Sins, at a Time, when she supposes they have received it. And a Person may expect to receive his Health by virtue of the Medicine operating after he has taken it, and prayed for his Health; and the Church may suppose, that Remission of Sins is to be obtained by the Influence, which the worthy receiving the Holy Communion will have upon those who receive it, after they have received it, and prayed for the Remission of Sins.

“ Besides this, says the Doctor, our Church teaches, that she does believe Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, are to be received by our worthy Partaking of the Holy Eucharist, as appears from the Prayer she has appointed to be said before our Partaking of it. There we say, Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son *Jesus Christ*, and to drink his Blood, that our sinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls washed thro' his most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.” But it does not appear by this Prayer, that our Church believes Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, are to be received by our worthy Partaking

### 372 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

of the Holy Eucharist, by the very Act of Partaking of it; unless it be necessarily implied in this Prayer, that all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are received by the very Act of Partaking of the Lord's Supper. But this Prayer may imply no more, than that all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, are to be received by worthily Partaking of the Lord's Supper, as it is a Means of receiving them, by leading our Thoughts, and consequently our Practice, to all those good Actions, which are necessary to qualify us to receive those Benefits. And, if in this Prayer, *to eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood*, signifies orally to eat the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, which are the appointed Signs and Memorials of the Body, or Flesh and Blood of *Christ*, the Sense of the Prayer is this, *Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat and drink the Bread and Wine, which are here appointed to be the Signs or Memorials of the Flesh, and Blood of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, according to thy Son's Holy Institution, in Remembrance of his Death and Passion, as that it may be an effectual Means of our sinful Bodies being made clean by his Body, and of our Souls being washed thro' his most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.* But if *to eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood*, signifies, spiritually, to eat the Flesh of *Christ*, and drink his Blood, whether by spiritually eating the Flesh of *Christ*, and drinking his Blood, we understand to believe in *Christ*, or actually to have a Share in the Merits of his Death, the Sense of the Prayer is this; *Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood, by Means of eating Bread and drinking Wine, according to thy Son Jesus Christ's Holy Institution, in Remembrance of him, as we are now*



*about to do, that our sinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls washed thro' his most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and be in us.*

The Doctor says next, "Does not the Church teach us, that it is in this Sacrament, that we eat the Flesh of *Christ*, and drink his Blood? Does she not plainly, and in express Words say, in the Exhortation at the Lord's Table, that — *The Benefit is great, if, with a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith, we receive that Holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood, then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us.*"

By eating the *Flesh of Christ*, and drinking his *Blood*, here, I suppose, the Doctor means to partake, or receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death; and it cannot be denied, but that Persons may be Partakers of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, in this Sacrament, that is, when they partake of it. For, if Persons are Partakers of these Benefits, when they come to receive this Sacrament, and are not deprived of them, before they do receive it, they, doubtless, are Partakers of them, when they do receive it. But it is impossible for Persons to partake of, or receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, in this Sacrament, by the very Act of receiving it, as has been above shewn<sup>a</sup>. And therefore, it cannot be the Meaning of the Church in this Exhortation, that by receiving this Holy Sacrament *we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood; we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; are one with Christ, and Christ with us*; that is, receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, by the very Act of receiving this Sacrament. The Church supposes, that the Persons,

<sup>a</sup> See Page 363, and also farther under this Prop.

### 374 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

to whom she directs this Exhortation, have been wilful Sinners, as indeed all Persons have been, whereby they forfeit all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, which they received at their Baptism. Now, if Persons can receive the Pardon of their Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, by having a *true penitent Heart, and a lively Faith*, with which the Church, in this Exhortation, exhorts them to come to the Lord's Supper, without actual Amendment of Life; then they receive the Pardon of their Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, as soon as they have this true penitent Heart, and lively Faith, and before they receive the Lord's Supper, and therefore cannot receive these Benefits by receiving the Lord's Supper. But if Persons cannot receive the Pardon of their Sins, and all other Benefits of *Christ's* Passion, if they have a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith *only*, without they have actually amended their Lives; then Persons coming to the Lord's Supper with a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith *only*, without actual Amendment of Life, cannot receive these Benefits by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper; for the Act of receiving the Lord's Supper, is not actual Amendment of Life. Understanding, therefore, by *eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood*, receiving all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as Dr. Brett does, the Sense of this Exhortation must be this; "The Benefit is great, "if with a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith, "we receive that Holy Sacrament; for then it "will help us to receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* "Death;" that is, as it is expressed in this Exhortation, *spiritually to eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood, to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwell in us, to be one with Christ, and*  
*Christ*

*Christ with us.* But if we have received these Benefits, before we partake of the Lord's Supper, then the Sense of this Exhortation is this; "The Benefit is great, if, with a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith, we receive that Holy Sacrament; for then it helps to preserve, and continue to us, all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death."

But if by *eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood*, we understand, to believe in *Christ*, which I have shewn to be most probably the Sense of the Church<sup>a</sup>; then the Sense of the Exhortation is this; "The Benefit is great, if, with a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith, we receive that Holy Sacrament, for then we believe in *Christ*, actually exercise our Faith, or the Act of Belief in him, are helped to dwell in *Christ*, and *Christ* in us, to be one with *Christ*, and *Christ* with us;" if we are not so before we receive the Lord's Supper; but if we are so before, then to believe in *Christ*, actually to exercise our Faith, or the Act of Faith in him, helps us to continue to dwell in *Christ*, and *Christ* in us; to be one with *Christ*, and *Christ* with us. If, by *eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood*, we understand, with Dr. Waterland, actually to have a Share in the Merits of *Christ's* Death; then, if we have not this Benefit before we receive the Lord's Supper, the Sense of the Exhortation is this; "The Benefit is great, if, with a true penitent Heart and lively Faith, we receive that Holy Sacrament, for then it helps us to have a Share in the Merits of *Christ's* Death, to dwell in *Christ*, and *Christ* in us, to be one with *Christ*, and *Christ* with us." If we have this Benefit before we receive the Lord's Supper, then the Sense of the

<sup>a</sup> See Page 343.



### 376 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Exhortation is this; “ The Benefit is great, if,  
 “ with a true penitent Heart, and lively Faith,  
 “ we receive that Holy Sacrament, for then it  
 “ helps us to preserve and continue to us a Share  
 “ in the Merits of *Christ*’s Death; then it helps us  
 “ to continue to dwell in *Christ*, and *Christ* in us;  
 “ to be one with *Christ*, and *Christ* with us.”

“ With what Face then, says the Doctor, can  
 “ this Author affirm, That in our Public Office  
 “ it is not supposed, that the worthy Partaking  
 “ of the Lord’s Supper, does itself operate this  
 “ Forgiveness, when our Public Office does so  
 “ expressly teach the contrary?” But as it ap-  
 “ pears, that our Public Office does not teach the  
 “ contrary, I think he may affirm it with a very  
 “ good Face.

“ This Author, says the Doctor, in the next  
 “ Place, denies that to be the true Meaning,  
 “ which all Expositors give to that Answer in  
 “ our Church Catechism, where the Thing sig-  
 “ nified in the Lord’s Supper is said to be *the*  
 “ *Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily, and*  
 “ *indeed, taken and received by the Faithful in the*  
 “ *Lord’s Supper.*” He says, — “ The Meaning  
 “ cannot be, that the Benefits of *Christ*’s Body  
 “ broken, and Blood shed, are verily, and in-  
 “ deed, taken and received by the Faithful in  
 “ the Lord’s Supper.” And in saying this, our  
 “ Author says what is certainly true; if by *in the*  
 “ *Lord’s Supper*, be meant *by the Lord’s Supper*;  
 “ by the very Act of receiving it. For he denies  
 “ not, that a Person may have taken and received  
 “ the Benefits of *Christ*’s Death, as far as he can  
 “ receive them in this Life, may be a Partaker of  
 “ them, in the Lord’s Supper, understanding there-  
 “ by at the Time he receives the Lord’s Supper:  
 “ But I affirm, that a Person cannot take and re-  
 “ ceive

ceive the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper; which is, what our Author means, when he says, the meaning of that Answer cannot be; "That the Benefits of *Christ's* Body broken, and Blood shed, are verily, and indeed, taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper." And whereas Dr. *Brett* says, he has proved him mistaken in that Point; yet the Doctor has not done so, neither can any Man do it, except he can prove, that the Nature of the Gospel Covenant is such, as that a Person can receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, without performing the Conditions, upon which they are to be received; or that, after a Person has performed the Conditions, upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, yet he cannot receive them, until he receives the Lord's Supper, that his receiving of them is deferred until his receiving the Lord's Supper; neither of which is true.

*First*, Suppose a Person can worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, if he truly repent of his Sins, and confess them to Almighty God, with full Purpose of Amendment of Life, without actual Amendment. If this Person, by thus repenting, with full Purpose of Amendment of Life, without actual Amendment, has not performed the Conditions, upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, but there is still wanting actual Amendment of Life; as the receiving the Lord's Supper is not actual Amendment of Life, a Person cannot receive all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper. If a Person by thus repenting, with full Purpose of Amendment of Life, without actual Amendment of Life, has performed the Conditions, upon which

which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, he receives these Benefits immediately upon his thus repenting, before he receives the Lord's Supper. For when a Person has performed the Conditions upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, his receiving them is not deferred until he receives the Lord's Supper; there is not the least Intimation nor Colour of Proof of this in the New Testament. Having therefore already received the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, when he receives the Lord's Supper, he cannot receive them at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper.

Secondly, Suppose a Person cannot worthily receive the Lord's Supper without both truly repenting and actually amending his Life. Now such a Person has performed the Conditions upon which the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are to be received, and so receives those Benefits immediately upon performing the Conditions before he receives the Lord's Supper, and therefore cannot receive them at and by the very Act of receiving that

Therefore the Sense of this Answer cannot be that the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are received at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper, because it is impossible. The Benefits of *Christ's* Death can be no otherwise taken and received by worthily partaking of the Lord's Supper, than as that is a Means of Persons receiving them, who have not already received them, by leading and helping them to such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions, as may beget in them that universal Obedience, which is the Condition upon which they are to be received; or as it is a Means of preserving those in the



the Possession of them, who have already received them, by helping and leading them to, or preserving in them, such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions, as may continue and confirm them in that universal Obedience. So that, if by receiving the Body and Blood of *Christ* in this Answer be meant receiving the Benefits of his Body broken and Blood shed, the Sense of it is this, "The Body and Blood of *Christ*, the Benefits of which being broken and shed, are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, as that is a Means to procure them to, or preserve them in the Possession of them." Or that the Lord's Supper is verily and indeed a Means of the Faithful's taking and receiving, or continuing in the Possession of the Benefits of *Christ*'s Body broken or Blood shed. And agreeable to this is the Sense of that Answer in our Church Catechism, which declares the Benefits of which we are Partakers by the Lord's Supper, to be, *The strengthening and refreshing of our Souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine.* The Strength and Refreshment of our Souls consist in their being virtuous and good; and whatever helps them to virtuous and good Thoughts, Dispositions, and Resolutions, strengthens and refreshes them; and by the Body and Blood of *Christ*, in this Answer, is meant the natural Body and Blood of *Christ*, and not the Bread and Wine; from which they are plainly distinguished; and the Remembrance of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, of the one broken and the other shed for our Sakes, which we must have, when we partake worthily of the Lord's Supper, helps us to good and virtuous Thoughts, Dispositions, and

Resolu-

### 386 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Resolutions, and so strengthens and refreshes our Souls, the Consequence of which is, that they become healthful and happy. There is another Sense, in which the Soul may be said to be refreshed, as it is rendered chearful, by being freed from all dull and melancholy Thoughts or Apprehensions about its Salvation. And this is done by the Remembrance of the Body and Blood of *Christ* broken and shed for our Sakes, which we must have when we partake worthily of the Lord's Supper. For this Remembrance gives Persons a Sense of their being secure of the Forgiveness of their Sins, the Mercy of God, and eternal Life, if they perform the Conditions of the Gospel Covenant; and so cheers and refreshes our Souls.

But besides all this with regard to the Sense of this Answer, I have above shewn, that it is most probable, that, by *taking and receiving the Body and Blood of Christ* in it, the Church means to *believe in Christ*.

Dr. *Waterland*, in the eighth Chapter of his *Review*, says also, That the Benefits of *Christ's* Death are received at, and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper; that the Holy Communion is *ipso facto*, in that very Act, and at that present Time, partaking of the Death of *Christ*, with the Fruits and Privileges of it. But this, from what has been already said, appears to be impossible. For either Persons are so qualified, as the Terms of the Gospel require them to be in order to their being Partakers of the Fruits and Privileges of the Death of *Christ*, and upon being so qualified do immediately receive them, before they come to the Lord's

See Page 347.

Supper,

Supper, and then they cannot receive them in the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper, and at that present Time, so as to have them conveyed to them by that very Act, and at that present Time; or if they are not so qualified, as the Terms of the Gospel require in order to their being Partakers of the Fruits and Privileges of the Death of *Christ*; then as they are not so qualified by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper, they cannot by that very Act, and at that very Time, be made Partakers of those Fruits and Privileges. God indeed, if he had pleased, might have made the Terms of the Gospel such, as that if a Person by Sin had lost the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, which he received at his Baptism, he should not again receive them, though he had repented of his Sins and amended his Life; until he received the Lord's Supper, and that he should receive them by and in the very Act of partaking of this, and not before. But the Terms of the Gospel Covenant certainly are not such; neither can any Thing be a sufficient Proof, that they are such, but an express Declaration of it in Scripture. That Passage of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, which Dr. *Waterland* brings in Defence of this Doctrine, contains no such express Declaration; though the Doctor says, that the Apostle there asserts, "That the Eucharist is actually a Communion of *Christ's* Body and Blood; that it is *ipso facto* in that very Act, and at that very Time by that Act, partaking of the Death of *Christ*, with the Fruits and Privileges of it." For besides the Uncertainty, that the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ* there signifies the Joint-partaking of the Benefits of his Death,



### 382 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

*Drath*, there is no Necessity to interpret the Apostle there as saying, that the Eucharist is the partaking of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at and by the very Act of receiving it. His Meaning may as well be, that the Bread and Wine are the Means of partaking of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as the due eating and drinking them leads Persons to, and preserves in them such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Actions, or that universal Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, which by the Terms of the Gospel is the Condition of Persons receiving the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. This Sense agrees very well with the Design of the Apostle in this Place, and gives sufficient Force to his Argument, for the Purpose for which he uses it, as has been before shewn<sup>a</sup>.

Dr. *Warren*, in the Conclusion of his second Part, says, " Since great Guilt may be contracted, and severe Judgments of God incurred by an unworthy Participation of the Lord's Supper; it is highly reasonable to believe, that the worthy Performance of this Duty is proportionably pleasing to God, and will be rewarded by such Returns of Blessings as may fully answer the Hazard and Mischief arising from an unworthy Manner of performing it." This our Author does not deny; but only contends, that these Blessings are not received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper, so as to be conveyed along with the material Elements by any Virtue annexed to them.

Mr. *Bowyer's* fourth Proposition is this, " That there are Promises made and Privileges annexed to the worthy receiving of it, viz. the Lord's Supper, and what these are."

<sup>a</sup> See under Prop. VIII.

Now,

Now, as has been said before, our Author does not deny, that there are Promises made, and Privileges annexed to the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper; and those same Privileges mentioned by Mr. Bowyer after this Proposition; and only denies, that these Privileges are received at, and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper; and nothing which Mr. Bowyer has said either before or after this Proposition proves that they are so received. To prove this Proposition he urges, first, "That the Bread and Wine are not mere empty Signs, but spiritually the Body and Blood of Christ." But though the Bread and Wine are not mere empty Signs, but Means to convey the Benefits of Christ's Death to the worthy Receivers of them; it does not thence follow, that they do convey these Benefits at and by the very Act of receiving them; and I have above shewn that they cannot be proved to be spiritually the Body and Blood of Christ upon the Account of their conveying them in that Manner.

Secondly he urges, "That the Bread and Wine are to be offered up unto God, and represent the all-sufficient Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross." But I have shewn that the Bread and Wine are not to be so offered to God.

Thirdly he urges, "That the Lord's Supper is a Covenants Rite, and an Act of communicating with God." But I shall hereafter shew, that the Lord's Supper is not so a covenants Rite, as to convey to Persons all the Benefits of Christ's Death at and by the very Act of receiving it; but that, if Persons have broken the Covenant, and forfeited those Benefits, or their Title to them, they must have renewed the Covenant before

### 384 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

before they receive the Lord's Supper, or they cannot renew it by that Act; and then they will also have regained those Benefits, or their Title to them, and so cannot regain them at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper. And hence also it will follow, that the Lord's Supper is not so an *Act of Communicating* with God, as to convey to Persons all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death at and by the very Act of receiving it.

At the Bottom of Page 83, Mr. Bowyer says, "That these Words — *He blessed, — this is my Body given, — my Blood shed* for you, signify nothing with our Author: But upon these Words of the Institution is grounded the Hope of receiving the Benefits of *Christ's* Death in receiving worthily this Holy Sacrament." But these Words do signify something with our Author, though not what Mr. Bowyer would have them signify. *He blessed*, our Author interprets to signify, *He gave Thanks and Praises to God*, and I have shewn there are many good Reasons to support this Interpretation. And though it should be allowed, as his Adversaries contend, that *He blessed*, signifies, *He prayed to God*; yet no Hope of receiving the Benefits of *Christ's* Death at and by the very Act of receiving worthily this Holy Sacrament can be grounded upon it, as I have shewn; because it does not appear from its being said in the general *He prayed to God*, what were the Contents of that Prayer. *This is my Body given*, and *this is my Blood shed* for you, our Author interprets to signify, *This is the Sign or Memorial of my Body given, and of my Blood shed* for you; upon which Sense of them no Hope can be grounded of receiving the Benefits



fits of *Christ's* Death at and by the very Act of receiving worthily this Holy Sacrament; and I have shewn, that the Bread and Wine are not the Body and Blood of *Christ* in that Sense, upon which only such Hope can be grounded, viz. That they are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them the Benefits of *Christ's* Death at and by the very Act of receiving them.

Mr. Bowyer comes next to shew particularly what are the Benefits annexed to the worthy Performance of this Duty, which he says are, the Pardon of our past Sins, the Assistance of the Spirit for the Time to come, or an Increase of Grace to enable us to overcome them, and Nourishment to eternal Life.

He first proceeds to prove, that Pardon of Sins is thereby received. He begins his Proof of this with laying down several Propositions as true. With regard to which I shall only observe, that, whereas he says, "the Lord's Supper is a confirming Rite in this Covenant," the Lord's Supper is no otherwise a *confirming Rite*, than as it is a Sign or Memorial, that God hath entered into such a Covenant with Men through *Jesus Christ*, and so a continual standing Evidence and Confirmation, that there is such a Covenant subsisting between God and Men; and that Mr. Bowyer has not proved it to be a *confirming Rite* in any other Sense; and if he understands it to be a *confirming Rite* in any other Sense, he ought explicitly to explain what that Sense is.

After laying down these Propositions he says, "The only Question that remains then, is, Whether there be any outward visible Sign ap-

### 386 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ pointed by Christ himself, as a Means to convey Forgiveness of Sins to those that sin after Baptism.” Mr. Bowyer takes the affirmative Side of the Question, which if he proves, then he may conclude, that Pardon of past Sins is conveyed at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord’s Supper; but if he does not prove this, the other must consequently fall. Let us see therefore what he offers to support it.

*First* he says, “ And here it may prejudice us in Favour of the Affirmative Side of the Question; if we consider that every wilful Sin is a Breach of the *Baptismal Covenant*; and that there remains little or no Hopes of being saved, until we are again in Covenant with God: And there is the same Reason why there should be a Means of conveying this Forgiveness to those who sin after Baptism, and truly repent of their Sin, why this second should be an outward visible Sign as well as the first.”

The Force of this Argument I take to be this, That there is the same Reason, that there should be an outward visible Sign appointed as a Means to convey Forgiveness of Sins to those who sin after Baptism; as that Baptism is an outward visible Sign appointed to convey Forgiveness of Sin to those who sin before it.

In answer to which I observe first, that Baptism is a Means of conveying Forgiveness of Sins to those who have sinned before it, at and by the very Act of receiving it, only as it is an external Means appointed by Christ, for the Admission of Persons into the Gospel Covenant, and upon receiving it Persons are admitted into the Gospel Covenant, and to all the Benefits of it, one of which is the Forgiveness of their past Sins.

*Secondly,*

Secondly, I shall not dispute about the Reasonableness of an *outward visible Sign's* being appointed as a *Means* to convey Forgiveness of Sins to those who sin after Baptism, because however reasonable this may appear either to Mr. Bowyer or me, yet if God has not appointed an *outward visible Sign* for that Purpose, there is no such *outward visible Sign*; neither is the Lord's Supper such a *Sign*. Mr. Bowyer next endeavours to prove, that the Lord's Supper is an *outward visible Sign* appointed by Christ, as a Means to convey Forgiveness of Sins to those who sin after Baptism, from those Words of the Institution, *This is the Covenant in my Blood which is shed for you—for many—for the Remission of Sins*. From these Words he argues thus, "Now if these Words prove, as has been shewn, that this is a covenanting Rite, and the Remission of Sins is part of this Covenant; if this *Cup communicates to us the Blood of Christ*, i.e. all the Benefits of Christ's Blood shed for us, as also has been shewn, one of which is Forgiveness; then the Consequence seems plain and undeniable, that this is a *Means* to convey Remission of Sins to the worthy Partakers of it." But if the Sense of these Words be, *This is the Sign of the Covenant founded in my Blood, which Blood of mine is shed for you, and for many, for the Remission of Sins*, as it certainly is, as I have before shewn\*, and the contrary cannot be proved; then these Words do not prove that the Lord's Supper is so a covenanting Rite, as to convey to the worthy Receivers of it the Benefits of Christ's Death, at and by the very

\* See Pag. 349.



### 388 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Act of receiving it. And as I have shewn that it cannot be proved from that Passage of St. Paul to the *Corinthians*, from which, I suppose, Mr. Bowyer says he has shewn it, that the *Cup does communicate to us the Blood of Christ*, i.e. all the Benefits of *Christ's* Blood shed for us, one of which is the Forgiveness of Sins, at and by the very Act of receiving it, the Consequence is, that the Lord's Supper does not appear by these Arguments, to be a *Means* of conveying the Remission of Sins at and by the very Act of receiving it.

Mr. Bowyer goes on, "To make this still more plain; the Induction runs thus: That which is for the *Remission of Sins*, is that which is shed; that which is shed, is that which is here called the *Blood of the Covenant*; and that which is here called the *Blood of the Covenant*, is the *Cup* which *Christ* took; the *Wine* in the *Cup*. The *Wine* therefore is that which is here said was shed for the *Remission of Sins*."—But the Induction does not run so; for that which is shed, is not here called the *Blood of the Covenant*. That which is called the *Blood of the Covenant*, is the *Cup* or *Wine* in it; and it is called the *Blood of the Covenant*, because it is appointed to be the Sign or Memorial of the *Blood of the Covenant*; but the real *Blood of the Covenant* is the natural Blood of *Christ*, which only was shed for the Remission of Sins, and not the *Wine* in the Lord's Supper. The Sense of these Words of the Institution is not this, This *Wine* is the Sign of my Blood, which *Wine*, the Representation of my Blood, is shed for you, and for many for the Remission of Sins; but the Sense is this, This *Wine* is the Sign of my Blood of the new Cove-

Covenant, which real and natural Blood of mine is shed for you and for many for the Remission of Sins<sup>b</sup>. And the Citation from *Hornbeck* at the Bottom of the Page does not prove the contrary. The Wine therefore in these Words is not said to be shed for the Remission of Sins; nor is it called the real Covenant for the Remission of Sins; and therefore there can be no Evidence from its being so called, that the Lord's Supper conveys the Remission of Sins at and by the very Act of receiving it.

“ These Words of our Saviour, Mr. *Bowyer* says, may be farther explained by those of *Moses*, *Exod. xxiv. Behold the Blood of the Covenant which the Lord hath made with you.* And what can this signify, but a Seal and Confirmation of the Covenant?—or a Token of the Covenant?” To which I answer, That this Blood of the Covenant, mentioned by *Moses*, is a Seal and Confirmation of the Covenant; but not as it is a Token and Memorial of it, in the Sense that the Wine in the Lord's Supper is a Token and Memorial of the Blood of *Christ*, or of the Covenant founded in it. But this Blood is called the Blood of the Covenant, and is a Seal and Confirmation of it, as it was used to give Force to the Covenant, as it was appointed by God to be shed before the Covenant was made, as an Expiation for the Impurities of the *Israelites*, and as that for the Sake of which the Covenant was made. The Blood here mentioned is the Blood of the Burnt-Offering and Peace-Offerings, which had just been offered before, *ψ 5.* as an Atonement for the Sins of the Children of *Israel*, that

▪ See under Prop. X.

### 390 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

God might be pleased to enter into that Covenant which he then made with them ; and for this Reason *Moses* calls it the *Blood of the Covenant*. In this Sense are these Words plainly explained, *Heb. ix. 18, &c.* In the three foregoing Verses the Apostle says, that the Gospel Covenant was confirmed, or received its Force, by the Death or Blood of *Christ*, so as that it was founded in and made for the Sake of his Blood shed, as appears from what I have said, under Prop. XVII. In *vs. 18*, he says, That this Covenant with the *Israelites* was also confirmed and received its Force by the Blood, here called by *Moses* the *Blood of the Covenant*. Now the Gospel Covenant is confirmed, and receives its Force from the Blood of *Christ*, as that by atoning for Men's Sins appeased God, so as that he was pleased to make this Covenant with them ; and therefore this Covenant with the *Israelites* was also confirmed and received its Force from the Blood called by *Moses* the *Blood of the Covenant*, as that was used to atone for the Sins or Impurities of the Children of *Israel*, that God might be pleased to make that Covenant with them. And hence it appears, that not the Wine in the Lord's Supper, but the real Blood of *Christ* only is the Blood of the New Covenant in the same Sense, in which the Blood of the Sacrifices is here called by *Moses* the Blood of the Covenant ; and therefore the real Blood of *Christ* only answers to this *Blood*, and not the Wine in the Lord's Supper, as our Author observes, Pag. 152 ; and so nothing can be proved from this Passage of *Moses*, concerning the Nature of the Lord's Supper, and all Conclusions of that Sort drawn from it are without Foundation,

In



In a Word, says Mr. Bowyer, Page 89. "*Water, Bread, and Wine*, are outward Signs ordained by *Christ* himself;—There is no more intrinſick Virtue in the *one*, than in the *other*; they are equally adminiſtered by Men: It is allowed, that *Water* is a Means of Grace, an Instrument of conveying *Forgiveness of Sins*; why ſhould not the other be allowed to be a Means of equal Efficacy and Force?" I answer, Becauſe *Bread* and *Wine* are outward Signs ordained for a different Purpose, than *Water* was. *Water*, or Baptiſm, is a Rite ordained for the Admiſſion of People into the Goſpel Covenant, and to all the Benefits of it, and ſo they may receive thoſe Benefits, as far as they can receive them in this World, at, and by the very Act of being baptized. *Bread* and *Wine*, or the Lord's Supper, is a Rite ordained to keep alive in us, and preſerve in the World, the Memory of *Chriſt*, who, by his Death, procured this Covenant for us; and thereby to lead and help us to keep and perform the Conditions of that Covenant, that ſo we may obtain, or continue in the Poſſeſſion of, the Benefits of it, both in this World, and the next. But there appears no Reaſon from this Deſign of the Lord's Supper, to infer, that it conveys to Perſons, the Benefits of this Covenant, at, and by the very Act of receiving it. The Terms of this Covenant are theſe; If a Perſon believes in *Chriſt*, and truly repents of his Sins, he is admitted into it by Baptiſm, and is made Partaker of all the Benefits of it, as far as he can receive them in this World, and entitled to what he is to receive in the next, at the very Time that he is baptized. If he afterwards breaks the Conditions of this Covenant by Sin, upon which theſe

Benefits are granted to him, and so loses them, he may again recover them, if he repents of his Sins, and amends his Life; and as soon as he has repented of his Sins, and amended his Life, he is again Partaker of these Benefits, in the same Manner, as he was at his Baptism: There is not the least Intimation in the *New Testament*, that after a Person, who has sinned after Baptism, has repented of his Sins, and amended his Life, he cannot be again a Partaker of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, until he has received the Lord's Supper; and until a Person has repented of his Sins, and amended his Life, let him do what he will, he cannot be again Partaker of those Benefits. So that a Person, who has sinned after Baptism, either must again partake of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, before he comes to the Lord's Supper, and then he cannot partake of them, at, and by the very Act of receiving that; or, as the Lord's Supper is neither Repentance nor Amendment of Life, he cannot likewise partake of them, at, and by the very Act of receiving it. And thus it appears, that tho' the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, one of which is the Pardon of Sins, are conveyed at, and by the very Act of receiving Baptism, there is no Reason from thence to conclude, that they are conveyed at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper. All that Mr. *Bowyer* says afterwards, concerning Absolution by the Lord's Supper, being founded in this, that the Lord's Supper is an outward visible Sign, appointed as a Means to convey the Pardon of Sins after Baptism, at, and by the very Act of receiving it, and as this appears to be false, that must consequently fall.

Mr. Bowyer next comes to answer what our Author has said against the Doctrine of the Pardon of Sins being conveyed by the Lord's Supper. He takes notice of that Passage of our Author, "If it be asked, Do we not partake of this Benefit, viz. Remission of our past Sins, by partaking of the Lord's Supper *worthily*? I must answer, No; if the Gospel be true." And the Reason given for this peremptory Negative, Mr. Bowyer says, is, "In that, no Pardon of past Sins is promised, unless to those, just converted, renouncing their Sins, and baptized into the Christian Faith; or to those, who, having sinned after Baptism, actually amend their Lives." In answer to this, Mr. Bowyer says, "The Question is not, whether, without Amendment, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper conveys Forgiveness of Sins? — But whether it is not a Means, even a necessary Means, of conveying it, even to those, who actually amend their Lives." And this, he says, he has already proved. In answer to which I say, that his Proof of it I have confuted.

Mr. Bowyer says, "It is farther evident from these Words of St. Paul—*He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself*; of Consequence, he, that eateth and drinketh worthily, is Partaker of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and eateth and drinketh Salvation to himself." Now, besides that *to be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and to be Partaker of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, are not properly opposed to each other, no more than *to eat and drink Damnation to himself, and to eat and drink Salvation*



### 394 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

to himself, are; because, Damnation here, signifies only a temporal Punishment, and Salvation, signifies an eternal Reward; it is not implied in these Words of St. Paul, that Persons bring upon themselves Damnation, at, and by the very Act of eating and drinking unworthily, so as to receive it together with the Bread and Wine. Mr. Bowyer goes on, " Suppose the Question " had been put by a *Jew*—— Do we not partake " of the Benefit of Remission of Sin, by our offering up Sacrifice *worthily*? Would this Author in like Manner have said, I must answer, " No; if the *Old Testament* be true? He must, " if he would be consistent with himself, since " the Reason he gives, is equally good in both " Cases: But what says God himself in Answer " to this Question?——*The Priest shall make Atonement for the Sin, that he hath committed, " and it shall be forgiven him.*" Lev. iv. 26.

But as God says this in the *Old Testament*, there is not the same Reason to say, that the *Jews* did not partake of the Benefit of Remission of Sins; at, and by the very Act of offering up Sacrifice worthily, as to say, that *Christians* do not partake of it, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper worthily; nor for our Author to deny it of both, if he would be consistent with himself. The Reason, why he says *Christians* do not partake of the Benefit of Remission of Sins, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper worthily, is; because God has nowhere in the *New Testament* promised, that Men shall receive Forgiveness of Sin, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper worthily; but only upon their Repentance and Amendment of Life: But in this Passage of *Leviticus*,  
God

God did expressly promise in the *Old Testament*, that Men should receive Forgiveness of Sin, at, and by the very Act of offering up Sacrifice worthily.

Mr. *Bowyer* goes on, " And why the Oblation of Bread and Wine, according the Command of *Christ*, and thro' Virtue of his all-sufficient Sacrifice of himself, should not be of as atoning a Nature, as the *Sacrifices of Bulls* and of *Goats*, under the Law, or, like them, be appointed Means of conveying Remission of Sins to those, who receive them worthily, I cannot imagine, nor see any Reason why it is so much disputed." But there is a very good Reason for this, tho' Mr. *Bowyer* cannot see it, which is this; that *Christ* hath not commanded the Bread and Wine to be offered up in Sacrifice to God, nor said, that by so offering them, the Sins of Men should be atoned for, and the Remission of Sins conveyed to them; which God did both command and say, of the *Sacrifices of Bulls and Goats* under the Law.

" Again, says Mr. *Bowyer*, if the Question be asked—Do we not partake of the Benefit of Remission of Sins, by our partaking of Baptism *worthily*? The same Argument will again oblige him to answer, No; if the Gospel be true; if he will be consistent with himself." But the same Argument will not oblige our Author to answer No to this Question; if he will be consistent with himself. For the Terms of the Gospel run thus, when Persons first become *Christians*, if they renounce their Sins, and are baptized, they receive Remission of Sins; in which it is implied, that tho' they do renounce their Sins, yet they shall not receive Remission of them, unless they are baptized also: But when  
Persons

### 396 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Persons sin after Baptism; if they actually amend their Lives, they receive Remission of Sins immediately upon that Amendment; and there is no Intimation, that the Remission of their Sins is deferred until they receive the Lord's Supper.

Mr. *Bowyer* goes on, " I can see no Reason, " why the Lord's Supper may not be made a " Means of obtaining Forgiveness of Sins committed after *Baptism*, as well as Baptism is of " those before it." Our Author does not deny, that the Lord's Supper is a Means of obtaining Forgiveness of Sins, but that it is a Means of obtaining Forgiveness of Sins, at, and by the very Act of receiving it. Neither does he pretend to see any Reason, why it might not have been made even such a Means, if God had been pleased to have appointed it to be so; but it is a very good Reason that it is not such a Means, because God hath not appointed it to be so.

What Mr. *Bowyer* says more under this Head, is answered in considering Dr. *Brett*.

2. " The next Privilege, says Mr. *Bowyer*, " annexed to the due Performance of this Duty, " is the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit—the " Increase of Grace to enable us to overcome."

In Proof of this, he *first* refers to the Texts of Scripture urged for it, under the first and third Propositions; which Texts of Scripture I have shewn do not prove it, in shewing, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, are not the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are Means to convey to the worthy Receivers of them, all Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at, and by the very Act of eating and drinking them.

As a farther Proof of it, he here adds those Words of the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, vi. 4. *Who have*



*have tasted of the heavenly Gift, and were made Partakers of the Holy Ghost*; "where, says he, "*partaking of the Holy Ghost* is annexed to the "*tasting of the heavenly Gift*; and that by *tasting of the heavenly Gift*, may be meant the "*eating the sacramental Bread and Wine*, seems "*probable*; 1. Because this is expressly called "*Bread, which cometh down from Heaven.*"

But this is no good Reason, for tho' Mr. Bowyer says, he hopes he may be now allowed to say, that these Words are to be understood of the *Eucharistical Bread*, yet from what I have said, it appears, he cannot be allowed to do it, and that the Sacramental Bread is not expressly called *the Bread which cometh down from Heaven.*

2. "Because the preceding Words *once enlightened*, confessedly signify *baptized*: And it is "reasonable to suppose, that the Apostle would "not omit the mention of the other Sacrament, "which always made a Part of the public Worship." Neither is this Reason good. For as confessedly as *enlightened* signifies *baptized*, so confessedly to *taste of the heavenly Gift, and to be made Partakers of the Holy Ghost*, signify to do this in *Baptism*, and not at the Lord's Supper. See *Whitby* on the Text. And it is very reasonable to suppose, that the Apostle might omit the mention of the Lord's Supper here, since he has omitted it in the second and third Verses, where Baptism is mentioned. Not but that I am inclined to think, that *tasting of the heavenly Gift*, here, signifies the same with *tasted the good Word of God* in the next Verse, viz. a Belief of the Gospel, and knowing and being sensible of the great and gracious Gift of the Gospel Covenant granted to Mankind for the Sake

of

### 398 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

of *Christ*, agreeable to that Expression in the Psalmist, *O taste and see how gracious the Lord is.* 3. "Because the Guilt here expressed is in much the same Words, with those used of the unworthy Communicant—*They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh—They are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.*" But there is not so much Likeness between these Words, as to prove, that because the latter are meant of the Lord's Supper, therefore the former are.

2. Mr. Bowyer says, "The Sacrament of Baptism is confessedly a Means of conveying the Holy Spirit; and therefore the Lord's Supper is so likewise." But I have shewn this Argument not to be conclusive under the foregoing Particular.

Mr. Bowyer goes on, "God, the Giver of all *Grace*, may appoint what Means he pleases of *giving*, require what Conditions also he pleases in us, of *receiving* it. He can give it with or without any *Instruments* or *Means*; but if he has been pleased to appoint *Water*, *Bread*, and *Wine*, as the Instruments of Conveyance, why should this be thought a Thing incredible? Or why should we dispute about it?" To which I answer, That God may appoint what Means he pleases of *giving*, and require what Conditions he pleases in us, of *receiving* the Holy Ghost. He can give it with or without any Instruments or Means; he may, if he pleases, appoint *Water*, *Bread*, and *Wine*, as the Instruments of Conveyance, and our Author does not think it incredible, that God may convey the Holy Ghost, if he pleases, by the Instruments of

of *Bread* and *Wine*, even at and by the very Act of receiving them, nor dispute about the Credibility of it; but he thinks that God has not been pleased to appoint *Bread* and *Wine* to be the Instruments of conveying the Holy Ghost at and by the very Act of receiving them; and for that Reason he contends, that the Holy Ghost is not so conveyed by them.

3. Mr. *Bowyer* says, "That (as this Author allows) the Benefit of God's Holy Spirit is annexed to the Duty of Prayer.—But now it hath been already observed, that the most effectual Prayer of a Christian is praying *in the Name of Christ*,—and the most proper Way of praying *in the Name of Christ*, is praying at the Holy Eucharist." In answer to which I observe, first, That praying in the Name of *Christ* at the Holy Eucharist does not appear to be at all a more proper Way of praying in his Name, then praying in his Name at any other Time. Secondly, Our Author does not deny that the Holy Ghost may be given in Answer to those Prayers, which being made for it during our Attendance upon the Lord's Supper, are joined to that Rite; and so the Holy Ghost may be given to us, or an Increase of it, while we are attending upon the Lord's Supper. But then it is given to us in Answer to and for the Sake of those Prayers, which we then make for it, and is not conveyed to us by the very Act of receiving the Bread and Wine, or by any Virtue annexed to those material Elements. And as Prayer is the Duty, to which God has annexed the Benefit of the Holy Ghost, so as that it is obtained and received by the very Act of praying for it, in such Sense as that God does immediately give it to  
Persons



400 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Persons upon their praying for it, other necessary Qualifications not being wanting; and as this Benefit is not annexed to the worthy partaking of the Lord's Supper, so as to be received at and by the very Act of partaking of it, and conveyed along with the material Elements; and as Prayer for the Holy Ghost is not a necessary Part of the Lord's Supper, or necessarily joined with it; therefore the Lord's Supper is neither designed nor ordained *peculiarly* for the obtaining of God's Holy Spirit, at and by the very Act of receiving it.

In Answer to this Argument Mr. Bowyer says, "No Body means that it is peculiarly, (*i. e.* solely) only together with Baptism, ordained for "this End." But the Argument to which this is an Answer, proves, that it is not at all ordained for this End, that is, to convey to the worthy Receivers of it the Holy Ghost, at and by the very Act of receiving it; and therefore it is not ordained for this End together with Baptism.

*Secondly*, he says, "Might he not as well have "said, that it is to contradict the express Words "of our Saviour, to say that Baptism is peculiarly designed for the obtaining God's Holy "Spirit?" To which I answer, No, if it be meant of obtaining God's Holy Spirit at the Time when Persons first become *Christians*; but I must answer, Yes, if it be meant of obtaining God's Holy Spirit after Persons are become *Christians*, and have been baptized; and in this latter Sense is our Author to be understood in this Argument. And the Reason for these two different Answers is this, That Baptism is appointed as a Rite, by receiving which, Persons upon their first becoming *Christians*, are

to be admitted amongst other Benefits of the Gospel Covenant, to a Right to, or an actual Participation of the Holy Ghost; but it is not appointed as a Rite, by which Persons are to obtain the Holy Ghost, or greater Degrees of it, after they are baptized. Prayer is the Means appointed for this End then. And I have before shewn, that it cannot be inferred, that the Lord's Supper is a Means of obtaining the Holy Ghost at and by the very Act of receiving it, because Baptism is so; inasmuch as they are Rites appointed for different Purposes.

*Thirdly*, Mr. *Bowyer* says, "It has been shewn, that Prayer necessarily attends the Lord's Supper." The Place where Mr. *Bowyer* means he has shewn this, is, I suppose, where he endeavours to prove, that *Christ* blessed the Bread and Wine, by praying to God over them. But I have shewn, that the Arguments brought to prove this are not sufficient to prove it against those which are brought to prove, that *Christ* blessed the Bread and Wine, by giving Thanks or Praise to God over them. I shall here add, That our Author, in asserting, that Prayer is not a necessary Part of the Lord's Supper, has the Authority of the Church of *England* on his Side. For in the Communion-Office she orders, "If the consecrated Bread and Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more, according to the Form before prescribed; beginning at—*Our Saviour Christ in the same Night, &c.*" So that he is to repeat only this Part of the Prayer of Consecration, "*Our Saviour Christ in the same Night that he was betrayed took Bread, and when he had given Thanks, he brake it, and gave*"

402 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ it to his Disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my  
 “ Body which is given for you, Do this in Re-  
 “ membrance of me. Likewise after Supper he  
 “ took the Cup, and when he had given Thanks,  
 “ he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of  
 “ this, for this is my Blood of the New Testa-  
 “ ment, which is shed for you, and for many  
 “ for the Remission of Sins ; Do this, as oft as  
 “ ye shall drink it, in Remembrance of me.”  
 And after this the Priest is to deliver the Bread  
 and Wine to the People, who have not yet re-  
 ceived the Lord’s Supper. Now I would ask,  
 Whether every Thing be here done, which is ne-  
 cessary for the due Celebration of the Lord’s Sup-  
 per? It is plain our Church thinks there is. For  
 she, doubtless, intends, that the Lord’s Supper  
 should be as duely and rightly administer’d to  
 and received by these last Persons, as the first ;  
 which yet is not done, except here is all done  
 that is necessary for the due Celebration of the  
 Lord’s Supper. And yet here is no Prayer used  
 that can be pretended to be necessary from any  
 Thing which is said in the Words of the Institu-  
 tion. As to those two short Petitions in the Words,  
 which the Minister is directed to say when he  
 delivers the Bread and Wine, they are plainly of  
 human Authority only, and have no Foundation  
 in the Words of the Institution. For *Christ* of-  
 fered up no Prayer when he delivered the Bread  
 and Wine to the Apostles ; but only said, Take,  
 eat, this is my Body ; and drink ye all of this,  
 for this is my Blood, &c. besides by the *Body*  
 and *Blood* of *Christ* in those Petitions is not meant  
 the *Bread* and *Wine* in the Lord’s Supper, but  
 the real *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. The Church,  
 in the *Rubrick* says, that the Priest shall begin at  
 these



these Words, *Our Saviour Christ in the same Night*, &c. for the *Blessing* of the Bread; and at *Likewise after Supper*, &c. for the *Blessing* of the Cup<sup>a</sup>. But by *Blessing* there she must mean, what Dr. *Waterland* means by it, *viz.* a setting apart the Bread and Wine from a common to an holy Use; and not, what the Adversaries for our Author mean by *Blessing*, *viz.* a praying to God over the Bread and Wine; since she has appointed no Prayer to be used for the *Blessing* of the Bread, or of the Wine. “After the Concession, says Mr. *Bowyer*, — that the Benefit of the Holy Spirit is “annexed to the Duty of Prayer; — is it not un- “accountable that he should say, — that Privi- “leges and Communications from above are “never expressly promised to this Duty — seem “to say that they are Fancies — Dreams, — that “Benefits received from all such *Performances* “by *reasonable Creatures*, cannot possible be re- “ceived but in a *reasonable Way*?”

To which I answer, first, That it is not at all unaccountable that our Author should say, that *Privileges* and *Communications* from above are not expressly promised to this Duty of receiving the Lord's Supper, tho' he does allow that the Benefit of the Holy Spirit is annexed to the Duty of Prayer; since Prayer does not appear to be a necessary Part of this Duty.

*Secondly*, That our Author does not say, that *Privileges* and *Communications* from above are *Dreams* and *Fancies*; as if there could not possibly be any such Things; but that it is a *Dream* and *Fancy* to think, that they are received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper worthily. Which it certainly is, since it

<sup>a</sup> See under Prop. VII.

#### 464 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

cannot be proved from Scripture, that they are so received by it.

*Thirdly*, When our Author says, That Benefits received from all such Performances, by reasonable Creatures, cannot possibly be received but in a reasonable Way, he does not mean that they cannot possibly be received but in a reasonable Way, if it does please God to appoint them to be received in a supernatural Way; but that they cannot be received but in a reasonable Way from the natural and reasonable Tendency of those Performances, when God has not been pleased to appoint them to be received in a supernatural Way; in such a Way, in which those Performances have not a natural Tendency to convey them, and in which they cannot convey them, without the supernatural Appointment and Assistance of God. This manifestly appears to be the Sense of our Author from these Words of his, which immediately follow this Assertion, Pag. 137. "But in the natural and reasonable Tendency of them, (*i. e.* of such Performances) we ought to found our main Expectations, unless we are otherwise directed by God himself." In which Words there is a plain Acknowledgment, that we may receive Benefits by such Performances otherwise than by the natural and reasonable Tendency of them, if God has directed us to expect to receive them otherwise, and by consequence has appointed them to be otherwise conveyed.

And hence these following Words of Mr. Bowyer appear to be nothing at all to the Purpose; "Let him shew how the Spirit is communicated to the Duty of Prayer; — let him

shew

“ shew, in a *reasonable Way*, how it operates upon Men; and then it shall be shewed him, that to suppose *Communications from above*, annexed to the worthy receiving the blessed Body and Blood of *Christ*, is no unreasonable *Fancy*.” For our Author does not argue, that it is an unreasonable *Fancy* to suppose Communications from above are annexed to the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper, so as to be conveyed at and by the very Act of receiving it; because we cannot shew, in a *reasonable Way*, how they can be so conveyed; but because God has nowhere in Scripture declared, that he hath appointed them to be so conveyed by it.

3. “ The next Privilege, Mr. *Bowyer* says, annexed to the due Performance of this Duty, is *eternal Life*.” Now he cannot mean, that eternal Life is received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper. For it is certain, that we do not receive eternal Life until after Death, when we come into the next World; I mean actually receive it. He must mean then only a Right and Title to eternal Life. But that even this is not received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper, appears from the Argument which I have so often made use of to prove, that all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death cannot be received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper. The only Argument Mr. *Bowyer* here brings to shew that this Privilege is annexed to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper at and by the very Act of partaking of it, is taken from the Sixth Chapter of *St. John*. But this Chapter cannot be proved, as has been above shewn, to be meant of the Lord's Supper.



#### 464 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

cannot be proved from Scripture, that they are so received by it.

*Thirdly*, When our Author says, That Benefits received from all such *Performances*, by *reasonable Creatures*, cannot possibly be received but in a *reasonable Way*, he does not mean that they cannot possibly be received but in a *reasonable Way*, if it does please God to appoint them to be received in a *supernatural Way*; but that they cannot be received but in a *reasonable Way* from the natural and reasonable Tendency of those Performances, when God has not been pleased to appoint them to be received in a *supernatural Way*; in such a Way, in which those Performances have not a natural Tendency to convey them, and in which they cannot convey them, without the supernatural Appointment and Assistance of God. This manifestly appears to be the Sense of our Author from these Words of his, which immediately follow this Assertion, Pag. 137. “But in the natural and reasonable Tendency of them, (*i. e.* of such Performances) we ought to found our main Expectations, unless we are otherwise directed by God himself.” In which Words there is a plain Acknowledgment, that we may receive Benefits by such Performances otherwise than by the natural and reasonable Tendency of them, if God has directed us to expect to receive them otherwise, and by consequence has appointed them to be otherwise conveyed.

And hence these following Words of Mr. Bowyer appear to be nothing at all to the Purpose; “Let him shew how the Spirit is communicated to the Duty of Prayer; — let him shew

“ shew, in a *reasonable Way*, how it operates upon Men; and then it shall be shewed him, that to suppose *Communications from above*, annexed to the worthy receiving the blessed Body and Blood of *Christ*, is no unreasonable *Fancy*.” For our Author does not argue, that it is an unreasonable *Fancy* to suppose Communications from above are annexed to the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper, so as to be conveyed at and by the very Act of receiving it; because we cannot shew, in a reasonable Way, how they can be so conveyed; but because God has no where in Scripture declared, that he hath appointed them to be so conveyed by it.

3. “ The next Privilege, Mr. *Bowyer* says, annexed to the due Performance of this Duty, is *eternal Life*.” Now he cannot mean, that eternal Life is received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper. For it is certain, that we do not receive eternal Life until after Death, when we come into the next World; I mean actually receive it. He must mean then only a Right and Title to eternal Life. But that even this is not received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper, appears from the Argument which I have so often made use of to prove, that all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death cannot be received at and by the very Act of partaking of the Lord's Supper. The only Argument Mr. *Bowyer* here brings to shew that this Privilege is annexed to the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper at and by the very Act of partaking of it, is taken from the Sixth Chapter of St. *John*. But this Chapter cannot be proved, as has been above shewn, to be meant of the Lord's Supper.

406 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Dr. Brett says, Page 148. that our Author tells us, "It is a Mistake to call it the Renewal of the New Covenant on our Part; and the Seal of it on God's Part." Both these the Doctor contends for. As to the Lord's Supper's being the Renewal of the Covenant on our Part, the Difference between the Doctor and our Author is for the most Part only verbal. When our Author denies the Lord's Supper to be the Renewal of the New Covenant on our Part, he means, after we have actually broke the Covenant, and are out of Covenant with God; but the Doctor, when he says it is the Renewal of the new Covenant, doth not mean after we have actually broken the Covenant, and are out of Covenant with God. He supposes us to be all along in Covenant with God, and calls the Lord's Supper the Renewal of the Covenant, only as we do, when we partake of it, again engage ourselves to perform our Part of the Covenant, Page 159. to which our Author agrees. For he says, Page 157. "Our partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper implies in it the promising to do our Part towards obtaining the Benefits of *Christ's* Death." But then we do not thus engage ourselves by *Act and Deed*, as the Doctor says, that is, by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper; and to prove which the Doctor has said nothing; but as this Engagement is implied in that Remembrance of *Christ*, which we must have when we worthily partake of the Lord's Supper.

As to the Lord's Supper's being a Seal of the Covenant on God's Part; if by a Seal be meant that which gives Force and Validity to the New Covenant, or the Power of conveying to us For-

giveness



givenness of Sins and eternal Life; that, for the Sake of which Men have a Right to the Forgiveness of Sins and eternal Life, if they perform the Conditions of the Covenant; it is certain, that the Death of *Christ* is the only Seal of it in this Sense, this alone confirms it, and gives it its Force and Strength. This Confirmation it received when *Christ* suffered Death upon the Cross; and it neither wants, nor can receive it again. If by a Seal be meant a Sign or Token of the New Covenant, so as that it is a continual standing Evidence, that God hath entered into such a Covenant with Mankind, the Lord's Supper is indeed a Seal of it in that Sense, as our Author will acknowledge. For the Lord's Supper is ordained in Remembrance of *Christ's* dying to obtain for us the New Covenant, and by Consequence in Remembrance of the New Covenant founded in his Death. And whatever is performed in Remembrance of any Thing, is certainly a Sign or Token, that that Thing either is or hath been; and is a continual Evidence, Pledge, and Testimony of it. But then God does not engage himself to receive us either by instituting this Sacrament at first, or by our receiving it now; but only testifies, that he has engaged himself to receive us, if we perform the Conditions of the New Covenant, of which this Rite is a Sign, Memorial, Evidence, Testimony, or Pledge. If by a Seal be meant that, which confirms to us the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, as it renders them more firm and secure to us, by leading and helping us to such Thoughts and Resolutions, as may confirm us in that universal Obedience, which is the necessary Condition of our receiving those Benefits; our Author acknow-

408 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

leges it to be a Seal of the Covenant in this Sense, as may be seen in Page 141. of his Book.

The Doctor says Page 162. "He takes it for granted, that a Man may receive this Sacrament *worthily, tho' the Viciousness of his Life contradicts the Profession of his solemn Devotions*: If we will not grant him this, all his Arguments against this Doctrine are good for nothing." By the Doctrine there mentioned the Doctor means, that by partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper, Persons are entitled to the Benefits of *Christ's* Death. But supposing a Person cannot worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, without he heartily repents and amends his Life; yet when such a Person partakes worthily of the Lord's Supper, he is not entitled to the Benefits of *Christ's* Death by partaking of it, but by repenting and amending his Life; and was entitled to the Benefits of *Christ's* Death before he partook of the Lord's Supper, and so could not be entitled to them by partaking of that, as has been before shewn. And if after he has received the Lord's Supper worthily, he continues in the steady Practice of all Virtue, he continues to be entitled to those Benefits, and will be finally made Partaker of them; yet this is owing to his continuing in the steady Practice of all Virtue, and not to his receiving the Lord's Supper worthily, any farther, than as the worthy receiving of that helps to preserve him in the steady Practice of all Virtue.

Again, Page 163. the Doctor says, "This is his *πρωτον ψεῦδος*, the grand Mistake or Fallacy, that runs thro' his whole Book. He all along takes it for granted, that this, that is, *the partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper*, is

“ no more than performing *one* single Duty of a  
 “ *Christian*, whereas, if it be *rightly* and *wor-*  
 “ *thily* performed, it includes in it ALL the Du-  
 “ ties of a *Christian*.” But tho’ the worthy  
 Performance of this Duty includes in it all the  
 Duties of a *Christian*; yet it can include them in  
 it only *intentionally* or *habitually*, that a Person  
 lives in the Practice of all the Duties of a *Chris-*  
*tian*: It cannot include them *actually*, so as that  
 a Person *actually* performs them all, when he  
 worthily performs this Duty; and therefore the  
 worthy Performance of this Duty, the worthy  
 partaking of the Lord’s Supper, the eating Bread  
 and drinking Wine in a serious and religious Re-  
 membrance of *Christ*, is the performing but of  
 one single Duty of a *Christian*. Whatever is ne-  
 cessary to qualify a Person to receive the Lord’s  
 Supper worthily; yet the Act of receiving it  
 worthily consists in eating Bread and drinking  
 Wine in a serious and religious Remembrance of  
*Christ*.

What the Doctor says of the Fathers teaching  
 the same concerning this Sacrament, which he  
 does, has been answered before.

Dr. *Waterland*, and Mr. *Bowyer*, seem to call  
 the Lord’s Supper a *covenanting Rite* in this  
 Sense; that if Persons have so far broke the  
 Gospel Covenant by Sin, as that they have for-  
 feited their Right to the Benefits of it, they can-  
 not renew the Covenant, so as to recover their  
 Right to the Benefits of it, but by receiving the  
 Lord’s Supper; that tho’ they have repented of  
 their Sins, and amended their Lives, they can-  
 not again be entitled to the Benefits of the Gos-  
 pel Covenant, until they have received the Lord’s  
 Supper; so as that the receiving of it conveys to  
 them



410 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

them a Right to those Benefits, at, and by the very Act of partaking of it; that they are admitted to this Right by the very Act of performing this Duty; and that God assures them by this Rite, that he admits them to those Benefits, by the very Act of their receiving it. But the Arguments brought by them, do not prove it to be a covenanting Rite in this Sense, as I shall endeavour to make appear. In order to which I observe,

1. That tho' Persons are admitted into the Gospel Covenant by Baptism, and to a Right to all the Benefits of it; it does not thence follow, that, if they have forfeited this Right by Sin, they are admitted to it again, by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper. Because it is expressly commanded, that Persons should be baptized, in order to their being first admitted to a Right to the Benefits of the Gospel Covenant; but it is not expressly commanded, that Persons should receive the Lord's Supper in order to their being again admitted to a Right to those Benefits, if they have forfeited it by Sin.

2. With regard to Circumcision's being called the Covenant, Dr. Waterland observes, Page 431. " That we may consider in *Circumcision*, " as in every other *Sacrament*, a *Sign* and a *Thing* " *signified*, or *both together* as one Transaction. " If the Name be applied to the bare *Sign*, then " Circumcision is not the Stipulation, but the " *Token* of it; if it be applied to the *Thing signified*, it means the Terms of Agreement; " But if it be applied to the whole Transaction " between both Parties, then it is formally the " *Contract* or *Stipulation* entered into here and " there." But now the *Contract* or *Stipulation*, entered into here and there, is either the very Act

Act of contracting and stipulating, or it is the same and not distinct from the Terms of Agreement; there is nothing, which the *Contract* or *Stipulation* can be, but one of these two. Now it is certain, that Circumcision is not the Terms of Agreement entered into here and there. For these are what is agreed to be done by both the Parties covenanting; but God does not agree to be circumcised in this Covenant made with *Abraham*. What God agrees to do, is to multiply *Abraham* exceedingly, and the rest that follows to *γ 9. Gen. xvii.* Circumcision then only is the Terms, which *Abraham* is to agree to; and not all the Terms neither. For he is moreover to walk before God and be perfect, *γ 1.* Neither is Circumcision the Act of contracting or stipulating. God does not contract and stipulate by *Abraham's* circumcising himself; but by promising what he does in the Beginning of the Chapter; nor does *Abraham* contract and stipulate by being circumcised any otherwise, than as he thereby signifies, that he agrees to the Terms of the Covenant required on his Part, which Act of Circumcision God appointed for the Admission of him into the Covenant, and a Sign of his being in, and agreeing to it.

3. Circumcision is never called the *Covenant* in the Old Testament, but in these two Senses; either as it is a Sign, Token, and Testimony, that God hath made such a Covenant with *Abraham* and his Posterity, as he made when he instituted this Rite; or as it is Part of the Terms of the Covenant on Man's Part. And when it is said of the uncircumcised Person, that *he hath broken the Covenant*, the meaning is, that he hath

412 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

hath broken it only by refusing to perform this Part of the Terms of the Covenant.

4. When Circumcision is called a *Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, which Abraham had yet being uncircumcised, Rom. iv. 11. the Meaning is not, as Dr. *Waterland* says, Page 431, "That it is a kind of Instrument, by which God sealed or assured to the Parties, his Acceptance of such Righteousness, as Abraham's was." But the Meaning of it is this, That as Circumcision was a Sign and Testimony, that God made a Covenant with Abraham, and by Consequence that Abraham was accepted by him, and in his Favour; so it was a Proof and Confirmation, that Abraham had Righteousness enough to be accepted by God without Circumcision; and that therefore other Persons might have so too, as is the Manner of the Apostle's arguing in this Place.

Having premised these Observations, I proceed to shew, that the Arguments, brought either by Dr. *Waterland*, or Mr. *Bowyer*, do not prove the Lord's Supper to be a covenanting Rite, as Persons, who have sinned after Baptism, are again admitted to a Right to the Benefits of the Gospel, at, and by the very Act of receiving it, and that they have not again that Right before they receive the Lord's Supper, tho' they have repented of their Sins, and amended their Lives; and that God assures them by the Lord's Supper, that he admits them to this Right, by the very Act of receiving it.

1. Mr. *Bowyer* says, "That the Lord's Supper is a material Sacrifice; and all material Sacrifices are covenanting Rites." But I have shewed,



shewed, that the Lord's Supper is not a material Sacrifice. *Ergo, &c.*

2. Mr. *Bowyer* says, " That the Lord's Supper is instituted in the room of the Passover; " and the Passover was a covenanting Rite." But if the Passover was a covenanting Rite, yet it does not appear from the Old Testament, that, if Persons had by any Transgression forfeited their Right to the Benefits of the Covenant made with the *Israelites*, they could not again recover or be admitted to that Right, tho' they had corrected the Transgression, until they kept the Passover; or that God assured them by the Passover, that he admitted them to this Right, by the very Act of keeping it. Therefore the Lord's Supper doth not appear to be such a covenanting Rite, by its coming in the room of the Passover.

3. Dr. *Waterland* says, Page 436. " That " the federal Nature of the Eucharist may be argued from what learned Men have shewn of " the Customs of divers Nations in *drinking* either *Blood*, or *Wine*, instead of Blood in ratifying of *Covenants*." But tho' it was the Custom of divers Nations to drink *Blood*, or *Wine* instead of Blood, for the ratifying of Covenants, when they were first made; it does not appear from thence, that by drinking *Wine* in the Lord's Supper, the Gospel Covenant is ratified in the Sense we are speaking of.

4. Mr. *Bowyer* says, " The Words of the Institution plainly prove this Sacrament to be a " *federal Rite; Take—Eat—Drink*. Now eating and drinking upon Bread and Wine offered to God, is plainly feasting upon a Sacrifice; and feasting upon a Sacrifice is a *federal Rite*." Dr. *Waterland* also brings this Argument

#### 414 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

ment of the Lord's Supper being a Feast upon a Sacrifice, to prove it to be a federal Rite, Page 460. But now the Bread and Wine are not offered to God as a material Sacrifice : But supposing they were, and the Lord's Supper was a Feast upon a Sacrifice ; yet it must be proved, that feasting upon a Sacrifice is so a federal Rite, as that after a Person has made, and is entered into a Covenant, and hath a Right to the Benefits of it ; if he should any way forfeit this Right, he cannot recover it by any Means, but by feasting upon a Sacrifice, and that it must be conveyed to him again by the very Act of so feasting ; tho' the Terms of the Covenant do not run, that he must do this to recover his Right ; and tho' the other Party covenanting remains firm to his Part of the Covenant ; I say, this must be proved, before it can appear, that the Lord's Supper is a federal Rite in the Sense I am now speaking of ; because it is a Feast upon a Sacrifice. But this has not been proved, *Ergo, &c.*

Mr. Bowyer adds, " But, as if this was not sufficient, our blessed Saviour tells us ; *This is my Blood of the New Covenant* ; or, as St. Luke and St. Paul express it, *this Cup is the New Covenant in my Blood.*" Dr. Waterland also brings these Words to prove the Lord's Supper to be a covenanting Rite, Page 436. But, when Christ says of the Wine, *this is my Blood of the New Covenant, or the New Covenant in my Blood*, the Sense is, <sup>a</sup> as has been already shewn, that it is the Sign or Memorial of his Blood, for the Sake of which the New Covenant is made, or the Sign and Memorial of the New Covenant made for the Sake of his Blood's being shed. And it does

<sup>a</sup> See Page 412, 423.

not appear to be any Consequence, that the Lord's Supper is a covenanting Rite in the Sense I am speaking of, because the Wine in it is a Sign and Memorial of the New Covenant.

5. In Proof of this, Mr. Bowyer urges these Words out of *John vi.* *He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.* But these Words cannot be proved to be spoken of the Lord's Supper; that by *Flesh* and *Blood* in them is meant the Bread and Wine therein.

" 6. The last Argument, Mr. Bowyer says " he shall urge in Proof of this Doctrine, shall " be taken from those Scriptures, where it is either expressly said, or plainly implied, that " *Christians* hold Communion with God, and " *with Christ.*" This Argument is also urged by Dr. *Waterland*, Page 435. But I have shewn, that these Texts of Scripture do not prove, that Persons have so a Communion with God and *Christ* in the Eucharist, as to be admitted to, and receive a Right to all the Benefits of the Gospel Covenant, at, and by the very Act of receiving it. The Texts of Scripture are *1 Cor. x.* and *1 John i. 3.*

7. Dr. *Waterland* says, " The federal Nature " of the Eucharist may be farther confirmed from " the very observable *Analogy*, which St. Paul " *1 Cor. x. 16.* takes Notice of and illustrates, " between the *Sacrament* of the Holy Communion, and the *Sacrifices* of the *Jews* and *Gentiles.* They were of a federal Nature by the " Apostle's Account of them; and so must this " be also."

\* See under Prop. VIII.



## 416 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

The Sacrifices of the *Jews*, here meant by the Apostle, were their Peace-Offerings; but it does not appear, that their Peace-Offerings were of a federal Nature in such Sense, as that, if Persons had forfeited their Right to the Benefits of the Covenant, which God made with the *Israelites*, by transgressing the Precepts of it, they could not again recover that Right, until they eat of the Peace-Offerings, tho' they had repented of, and corrected their Transgressions; or that God assured them by the Peace-Offerings, that he admitted them to that Right again, by the very Act of their offering, or eating of, them. Neither does it appear, that the Sacrifices of the *Gentiles* were of a federal Nature in such Sense, as that, if Persons were got free from the Influences and Communications received from Devils, they could not again receive them, but by the very Act of eating of those Sacrifices. And therefore, the Lord's Supper cannot be proved to be of a federal Nature in the present Sense of the Question, by any Analogy, which the Apostle draws between it, and the Sacrifices of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*.

Mr. Bowyer says, Page 73. " Let us now consider the most material Objections against this Doctrine urged by our Author. And in the first Place, I observe in general, that if his Arguments prove any Thing, they seem to prove too much: Instead of the *Lord's Supper*, put the other Sacrament, *Baptism*, then try the Argument, and it will be equally conclusive against *Baptism's* being a *federal Rite*." No, it will not; because it may be said in Answer to the Argument with regard to Baptism, that it appears from the New Testament, that Baptism is an  
outward

outward Rite appointed by God, by the very Act of receiving which Persons are to be admitted into the Gospel Covenant, and to a Right to all the Benefits of it: But it cannot be said, in Answer to it, with regard to the Lord's Supper, that it appears, that the Lord's Supper is appointed to be an outward Rite, by the very Act of receiving which Persons are to be admitted to a Right to the Benefits of the Gospel Covenant, if they have forfeited them by Sin after Baptism. But, for ought that appears in the New Testament, they have again a Right to these Benefits, if they repent and amend their Lives, without receiving the Lord's Supper. In order to continue in the Covenant and preserve this Right, they must indeed receive the Lord's Supper, when they have an Opportunity: But this is not required of them, because the Lord's Supper conveys and confirms to them this Right, at, and by the very Act of receiving it; but because it is Part of the Terms of the Gospel Covenant, without performing all which, they cannot have a Right to the Benefits of it; and as it is also a Means of continuing to them this Right, by leading and helping them to perform the Conditions of the Covenant, in the Manner taught by our Author.

Mr. Bowyer goes on, "And should a Quaker, who makes a *verbal Profession* of his Faith, and his *Amendment of Life*, argue in the same Words with this Author, I cannot see how he could well convince him of the Necessity of being baptized in order to be in Covenant with God, and in a State of Salvation." But I think it is very plain he might convince him of it, by telling him, That it is commanded,

E e                      •that

# 418 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

that a Person should be baptized immediately upon his first believing in *Christ*, and his first becoming a *Christian*, and therefore without being baptized he cannot be in Covenant with God, both as Baptism is an outward Rite appointed by God, by the very Act of receiving which Persons are to be admitted into the Covenant, and as the receiving it is part of the Terms of the Covenant.

Mr. Bowyer goes on, "Throughout this whole Discourse, he seems to lay the main Stress upon the *Condition* of the Covenant alone, without any Consideration of the *Means* of conveying the Benefits of it to those who perform the Conditions. Whereas our Performance of the *Condition*, *Amendment of Life*, or even *Obedience*, without wilful Transgression, gives us no covenanted *Right to Salvation*, if we willfully neglect the *instituted means* of conveying it."

Now this Assertion implies a plain Contradiction; it supposes that a Person can perform the Condition of the Gospel Covenant, and yet wilfully neglect to receive the Lord's Supper, this instituted Means of conveying a Right to the Benefits of it, which is itself a Part of the Condition. For *to receive the Lord's Supper*, is as much a Part of the Condition of the Gospel Covenant as any other Duty; and the wilful Neglect of it deprives a Person of a Right to the Benefits of the Covenant, as much as, and for the same Reason, that the wilful Neglect of any other Duty does. And if a Person performs the Condition of the Gospel Covenant, except this one Part of it, *the Receiving the Lord's Supper*, supposing



supposing that to be possible, by the wilful Neglect of this he loses his Right to the Benefits of the Covenant; not because it is an instituted Means of conveying that Right at and by the very Act of receiving it, to Persons who have lost that Right by sinning after Baptism; but because the Lord's Supper is a Part of the Condition of the Covenant.

And tho' Mr. Bowyer says in the next Words, "In human Contracts the very Payment of the Money gives no *legal Right* to the Estate, if the Writings are not signed and sealed;" supposing this to be true, the Reason of it is, because human Laws appoint the signing and sealing of the Writings, to be a Means to convey a legal Right to the Estate by the very Act of signing and sealing; and it is no Proof nor Illustration of the Lord's Supper's being a Means of conveying a Right to the Benefits of the Gospel, at and by the very Act of receiving it, to Persons who have lost that Right by sinning after Baptism, except it be supposed, that the Divine Law has appointed it to be such a Means, which is the Point in Question, and cannot be supposed to support a Proof of itself. Tho' I rather take the Case to be, that the Payment of the Money does give a *legal Right* to the Estate, and that the Writings are signed and sealed not to give a legal Title, but to continue an Evidence and Testimony, that there is a legal Title given.

To what our Author says, that, "The repeated Acknowledgment of our being entered in to such a Covenant is by no Means the Renewal of the Covenant," Mr. Bowyer says, "With respect to the happy Person who hath  
E e 2 kept

420 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

“ kept his Baptismal Vow, his receiving of the  
 “ Lord’s Supper is a repeating of the Covenant;  
 “ — with respect to the wicked Christian, who  
 “ has *broken his Covenant*; if he be renewed again  
 “ by *Repentance*, and then receives the Holy  
 “ Sacrament, it is the *Renewal* of the Cove-  
 “ nant.” If in *Repentance* be included actual A-  
 mendment, it cannot be proved, that the wick-  
 ed *Christian* by receiving this Holy Sacrament re-  
 newes the Covenant in the Sense we are speaking  
 of, viz. that he receives again his Right to the  
 Benefits of the Gospel Covenant at and by the  
 very Act of receiving it, except it can be proved,  
 that the Terms of the Gospel are such, that if  
 a Person has lost his Right to the Benefits of it  
 by sinning after Baptism, though he has repent-  
 ed and amended his Life, yet his receiving again  
 this Right is deferred until he receives the Lord’s  
 Supper; but this cannot be proved. On the  
 contrary, the Terms of the Gospel appear to be,  
 that if a Person has lost his Right to the Bene-  
 fits of it, by sinning after Baptism, he shall im-  
 mediately receive it again upon his repenting and  
 amending his Life. If in *Repentance* here actual  
 Amendment be not included, it is then plain,  
 that the wicked *Christian* cannot again receive  
 a Right to the Benefits of the Gospel at and by  
 the very Act of receiving the Lord’s Supper;  
 because, without actual Amendment of Life, he  
 cannot again receive this Right by any thing that  
 he can do, and the receiving the Lord’s Supper  
 is not actual Amendment of Life.

Mr. Bowyer goes on, “ May not God as well  
 “ say of the Non-communicant, as of the *uncir-*  
 “ *cumcised Man Child*, that he hath *broken my*  
 “ *Covenant?*” To which I answer, Yes. But  
 then

then as it was said of the *uncircumcised Man Child*, he hath *broken my Covenant*, because he refused to be circumcised, which is Part of the Terms of the Covenant<sup>a</sup>; so the Reason why it may in like Manner be said of the *Non-communicant*, he hath broken my Covenant, is, because the receiving the Lord's Supper, is Part of the Terms of the Covenant, which he neglects to perform; and not because the Lord's Supper is a covenanting Right in the Sense we are speaking of. And then it does not follow, as Mr. Bowyer would infer, That "it may be said of the *true Penitent* " and *worthy Communicant*, that he hath *renewed* the Covenant," in the Sense we are speaking of. If in the true penitent and worthy Communicant be included actual Amendment of Life, the worthy Communicant has indeed renewed the Covenant; has recovered his Right to the Benefits of the Covenant, which he had forfeited by Sin; but he has recovered this Right by performing the Terms of the Covenant, and not at and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper. In Answer to what our Author says, "That the Death of *Christ* is the *only Seal* of the Covenant;" Mr. Bowyer says, "that the Blood of *Christ* is the *Price* of the Covenant;" and that the Holy Spirit is rather the Seal of it, because we are said to be *sealed by the Holy Spirit*." But the Blood of *Christ* is both the *Price* and the *Seal* of the Gospel Covenant. It is that for the Sake of which God is pleased to make that Covenant with Men; and it is the Seal of the Covenant, as it is a Testimony to the Truth of it; as *Christ* by his Blood shed, or in other Words, by his Death, gave Testimony to

<sup>a</sup> See Page 411. Obl. 3.



## 422 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

the Truth of his Doctrine, by dying for it, and consequently to the Reality of that Covenant, which he taught Men God had made with them. And though we are said to be sealed by the Holy Spirit, it does not appear from thence, that we are so sealed by him at the Lord's Supper, as that he again conveys to us at and by the very Act of receiving it a Right to the Benefits of the Gospel, when we had forfeited it by sinning after Baptism.

To what our Author says, "That the real Blood of *Christ* answers to the Blood called by *Moses*, the Blood of the Covenant, Exod. xxiv. 8. and not the Wine in the Lord's Supper;" Mr. *Bowyer* answers, that "this is to contradict the Words of our Saviour, and his own also; since he allows, that when he spoke these Words, *This is my Blood of the New Covenant*, he did not mean that real Blood which was to be shed, — but *Wine* to be drunk in Remembrance of it." But I cannot see, that this Proposition, The real Blood of *Christ*, and not the Wine in the Lord's Supper, answers to the Blood of the Sacrifices, called by *Moses* the Blood of the Covenant, contradicts this, viz. *Christ*, when he called the Wine his Blood at the Institution of the Lord's Supper, did not mean, that the Wine which he called his Blood, was that real Blood which was to be shed, but *Wine* to be drunk in Remembrance of that Blood, for this is what our Author says, Page 150. the Place referred to by Mr. *Bowyer*. That the real Blood of *Christ*, and not the Wine in the Lord's Supper, answers to the Blood of the Sacrifices, called

called by *Moses, the Blood of the Covenant*, I have already shewn\*.

And what is there said will furnish an Answer to what Dr. *Waterland* says to the contrary, Page 463. The Doctor says, "That the Truth of this, viz. that to the Blood of the Sacrifices (for the Blood of these Sacrifices only is called by *Moses* the Blood of the Covenant) called by *Moses, the Blood of the Covenant*, answers the real Blood of *Christ* shed upon the Cross, and not the Wine in the Lord's Supper, stands only in the equivocal Meaning of the Word *answers*: For if he meant it of the *Antitype* answering to the *Type*, it is true what he says, that our Lord's real Blood answers in that Sense to the Blood of the Sacrifices; and it answers also to the Wine, the Symbol of it; but if he meant it (as he ought to have meant) of *Symbol* answering to *Symbol*, or of one *Typical Service* answering to another *Typical Service*, by way of *Analogy*; then it is plain, that the Wine in the Eucharist so answers to the Blood of the Sacrifices, being that they are Representations of the same Thing."—To which I answer, That though the Wine in the Lord's Supper does answer to the Blood of the Sacrifices, called the *Blood of the Covenant*, as they are both *Symbols*, *Typical Services*, and *Representations* of the same thing, viz. the Death of *Christ*; the one *Prefigurative* of it, the other *Commemorative*; yet they answer to each other in this respect no farther, than as they do represent the same Thing; but not so far as that the Wine is used in the same Man-

\* See Page 390.

ner, and for the same Purpose under the Gospel Covenant, in order to commemorate the Death of *Christ*, as the Blood of those Sacrifices was used under the *Mosaical* Covenant to prefigure the Death of *Christ*. And therefore though those Sacrifices and the Lord's Supper, are both Symbols of the Death of *Christ*; yet it cannot from thence be concluded, that they are alike in every other respect. And I have shewn in the Place referred to, that the Wine in the Lord's Supper is not used in the same Manner, and for the same Purpose under the Gospel Covenant, as the Blood of those Sacrifices was used under the Law, and that it is not the Blood of the Gospel Covenant in the same Sense, in which the Blood of those Sacrifices was the Blood of the *Mosaical* Covenant; that the Blood of those Sacrifices was the Blood of the Covenant, as it was used as an *Expiation*, and as the *Price* of the Covenant; but that the Wine in the Lord's Supper is the Blood of the Covenant, as it is the Representation and Memorial of that Blood, which is *expiatory*, and the Price of the Covenant. So that That only which was applied to the same Purpose under the Gospel Covenant, which the Blood of those Sacrifices was applied to under the *Mosaical* Covenant, is the real Blood of *Christ* shed upon the Cross; and then that which answers to the Blood of those Sacrifices under the Gospel, so as to be the Blood of the Gospel Covenant in the same Sense in which the Blood of those Sacrifices was the Blood of the *Mosaical* Covenant, is only the real Blood of *Christ* shed upon the Cross. As to what Mr. *Bowyer* says every one did who kept the Passover, our Author allows, that Persons do the same in Effect by



by receiving the Lord's Supper; but then he says, that those Acknowledgments, Professions, or Promises, are not peculiar to the Holy Communion; but may be done every Day, every Hour, and the Covenant be as well renewed by them then as at the Lord's Supper. No, says Mr. Bowyer, "It cannot with Reason be said, that the renewing our Part of the Christian Covenant is not peculiar to the Holy Communion, because Christ hath not said of any Form in particular, or of a verbal Profession in general, as he says of the Cup in the Eucharist, *This is my Covenant.*" When Christ says of the Cup in the Eucharist, *This is my Covenant*, the Meaning is, This is the Representation, or Memorial of the Covenant, founded in my Blood, or of my Blood, for the Sake of which the new Covenant is made; and not, this is the Means of your renewing the Covenant, at and by the very Act of receiving it, so that you cannot renew it, but by drinking of this Cup. And how does it appear, that because Christ says of the Cup in the Eucharist, *This is the Representation or Memorial of my Covenant*, therefore the Renewing our Part of the Christian Covenant is peculiar to the Holy Communion, and that it cannot as well be done at any other Time?

Mr. Bowyer goes on, "God says of Circumcision, *This is my Covenant.* Should an uncircumcised Israelite have said, I in Words make a Covenant with God, but I will not be circumcised; could it be said of him, notwithstanding his verbal Professions, that he was in Covenant with the God of Israel, whilst he continued in the wilful Transgression of this

1

" Law ?

“Law? And does not God say of him, *that he hath broken my Covenant?*”

It is true, such a Person would not be in Covenant with the God of *Israel*; but the Reason is, because he continued in the wilful Transgression of this Law, which is Part of the Terms of the Covenant; and God says of him, *he hath broken my Covenant*, because he refuses to perform this Part of the Terms of it.

So with regard to what he says next, “*Christ*” says of the Cup, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Covenant*. And should a professed *Christian* say (as many do in Effect say) I never did, never will receive this Cup, of which *Christ* says, *this is my Covenant*: But still I in Words make, I renew my Covenant with God; is he therefore in Covenant with him? has he therefore a covenanted Right to the Promises of the Gospel? No, he has not; but the Reason is, because the receiving the Lord’s Supper is Part of the Terms of the Gospel, like any other Duty, which Part he wilfully neglects to perform; and not because the Lord’s Supper is a Means appointed to renew the Covenant, and again to convey to Persons a Right to the Promises of it, at, and by the very Act of receiving it, if they have forfeited that Right by Sins after Baptism.

“If God, says Mr. Bowyer, vouchsafe to covenant with Man, and Man is permitted to enter into Covenant with God; and even upon the Breach of it, is again permitted (once again at least) to renew it; may he not appoint what Ways and Means he pleases of re-

<sup>a</sup> See Pag. 411.

“newing

"newing it?" Yes certainly; neither does our Author deny it: But what he denies is, that God hath appointed the Lord's Supper as a *Way* and *Means* of renewing the New Covenant; at, and by the very Act of receiving it; and which I hope I have shewn his Adversaries have not been able to prove.

Having thus considered the principal Objections brought against the Doctrine taught by our Author concerning the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, and given, I hope, a sufficient Answer to them; and by which also any other Objections may be removed, which have not been particularly considered, I shall set down the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, as from hence it appears to be taught by him in his Book.

I. It is not necessary to offer up a Prayer to God, for the Blessing of the Bread and Wine. Or, if it be, yet nothing can be concluded from thence, to prove the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper to be different from what they are here represented to be.

II. The Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as they are the Signs, Representations, or Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, being appointed to be so.

III. The Bread and Wine are not to be offered to God, as a material Sacrifice, to put him in Mind of the Sacrifice of *Christ* upon the Cross.

IV. The Bread and Wine are to be eaten and drunk by *Christians* in a serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*, in order to revive and preserve in them the Remembrance of *Christ*, of his coming into the World, and doing what he did for Mankind.



## 428 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

V. A Person, who eats this Bread and drinks this Wine at the Lord's Supper, with a serious and *Christian* Frame of Mind, and a Behaviour suitable to the Design of the Institution; partaking of it, as a sincere Disciple of *Christ*, under the Sense of his own strict Obligations, as such, remembering his Body broken and his Blood shed at the same Time; and doing the whole in Remembrance of *Christ*, as his Lord and Master, receives the Lord's Supper worthily.

VI. A Person receives the Lord's Supper unworthily, and incurs the Penalty threatened by *St. Paul* to those who do so, who without considering the Duty he professes to perform; without a serious regard to the Remembrance of his Lord and Master, for which it was commanded, eats this Bread and drinks this Wine, either with no Thought at all of the End of this Institution; or with Thoughts, a Temper of Mind and Behaviour, utterly inconsistent with this Holy Rite, or with a *Christian's* Duty at any Time.

VII. In this serious and religious Remembrance of *Christ*, is included a Belief in *Christ*, an Acknowledgment of our being his Disciples, and obliged to all the Duties he hath commanded, and a sincere Design and Resolution to perform them; and if we have transgressed these Duties, a sincere Desire, Disposition, and Resolution to amend our Lives.

VIII. All Persons, before they receive the Lord's Supper, should examine their Hearts and Dispositions by the Institution of this Holy Rite, so as to satisfy and assure themselves, that they come to the Lord's Supper, as his sincere Disciples, resolved to eat and drink in a religious Remembrance of him.

IX. A

IX. A true and sincere *Christian*, one, who sincerely endeavours to obey all the Precepts of the Gospel, needs not any Length of Time to assure his Heart of this. Neither can the Opportunities of this Solemnity come so suddenly upon him, but that he may certainly know himself to be prepared in this absolutely necessary Sense. He may have sufficient Time even in the Church itself, just before the partaking of the Bread and Wine, to satisfy himself, that he is prepared. And therefore such a Person can have no Reason to abstain from the Lord's Supper at any Time, because he has not spent a long Time in the previous Examination and Preparation of himself, nor has Leisure so to do.

X. A wilful Sinner cannot receive the Lord's Supper worthily, until he has so far repented of his Sins, as to be truly sorry for them, and sincerely desirous, disposed, and resolved to amend; so truly and sincerely, as that, as far as he is able to judge, he shall act agreeably to that Resolution in his future Conduct. Because this is implied in the religious Remembrance of *Christ*, which is essential to the Performance of this Duty. But then this Repentance is not a Duty *peculiar* to the Lord's Supper; it is not required of Persons *particularly* upon the Account of their receiving the Lord's Supper: But is what would have been equally their Duty, tho' the Lord's Supper had never been instituted; and is a Duty incumbent upon all Persons who have sinned, tho' they are not coming to the Lord's Supper; tho' they have no Design nor Opportunity to receive it.

XI. When Persons come to receive the Lord's Supper, their principal Care should be, that they  
do

430 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

do particularly call *Jesus Christ* to their Remembrance, as what he really is; and actually believe and exercise their Faith in him, as such; as their Redeemer and Master, who hath both redeemed them from Sin, and given them Laws, their Obedience to which he requires, as the Condition on their Part of their being Partakers of the Redemption made by him. And when they receive the Bread and Wine, and eat and drink them, they should particularly believe, and actually exercise their Faith in his Body broken, and his Blood shed for their Sakes, and be thankful to God for it; that so they may eat the Bread and drink the Wine, the Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, with a religious Remembrance of him. If they have Leisure, during their Attendance upon this Rite, farther to exercise and employ their Thoughts, which the Custom of the Church of *England* generally gives them, it is an Employment of them very proper, and very agreeable to this Institution, to revive in their Minds upon this Occasion, the Force of all those Arguments, upon which they believe in *Christ*; to own themselves his Disciples; to confess and heartily condemn all their Deviations from, and Transgressions of his Laws and Precepts; to acknowledge before God their Obligations to live as his Disciples; who expect to be happy upon his Terms only; to express their sincere Thankfulness for his Doctrine, Example, Life, and Death; to profess their Dependance upon him, as their only Head; and lastly, to revive and enlarge their affectionate Union and Sympathy with all other Members of the same Body throughout the World.



XII. The Benefits to be received by partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper are, *First*, in the general, All that Favour and Acceptance of God, which accompany our Obedience to any of his Commands, or the due Performance of any Duty.

*Secondly*, What it is more particularly the Design of the Lord's Supper to confer, which is, that it leads our Thoughts, and consequently our Practice to all that is Good, and to all that is necessary for us to ask of God, and to act ourselves towards our Advancement in Holiness; it tends to revive and keep alive in our Minds all such Thoughts, Dispositions, and Tendencies, as are proper to work upon the Conduct of our whole Lives. For so particularly to remember *Christ*, and believe in him, as their Redeemer and Master, who requires their Obedience to his Laws, as a necessary Condition of their receiving the Benefits of the Redemption purchased by his Death, which Persons must do, when they receive the Lord's Supper worthily, must make them sensible both of the great Love of *Christ*, in dying to redeem them from their Sins, and of the Necessity of an universal Obedience to his Commands in order to their being happy in the next World; which are the strongest Motives to move us to forsake all Sin, and practice all Virtue; and to beget in ourselves such a Frame and Temper of Mind, as is necessary towards this. And particularly to call *Christ* to their Remembrance, actually to exercise their Faith in him, to be sensible of the Necessity of an universal Obedience to his Laws, and sincerely to design and resolve to obey them, which Persons do, when they receive the Lord's Supper worthily, tends to confirm,

firm, and render habitual in them that Remembrance and Faith, those good Purposes and Resolutions; to make them more firm and durable, less apt to be lost and destroyed, to be forsaken and broke through; whereby they become less liable to neglect the Conditions, upon which eternal Life is promised, and more secure of obtaining Salvation. The Lord's Supper, by thus leading and helping Persons to such Thoughts and Resolutions, as may confirm them in that universal Obedience, which alone can intitle them to the Promises of *Christ*, is a Means to procure them the present Favour of God, and to intitle them finally to his Favour in Heaven; and to render them fit for all such Assistances as are proper for him to give to free and reasonable Creatures. It *strengthens* and *refreshes* their Souls; as the Bread and Wine, considered and taken therein as Memorials of the Body and Blood of *Christ* their Master, lead them, by their peculiar Tendency, to all such Thoughts and Practices, as are indeed the Improvement and Health of their Souls. It gives Strength and Refreshment to the Soul, to enable them to persevere and continue in the Practice of Virtue; and it cheers and refreshes the Soul with the Assurance and Hope of receiving eternal Life, as the Reward of their Service.

Let us now, before we conclude, consider, Whether, according to this Representation of the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper given by our Author, it appears to be a lower and meaner Ordinance, of less Dignity and Importance, and less worthy the Reverence, Esteem, and Value of *Christians*, than according to the Representation of

of the Nature and Design of it given by his Adversaries.

That only, which renders an Ordinance high, honourable, and important, and worthy the Reverence, Esteem, and Value of Men, is either the Authority of it, or the Benefit of it to Mankind. Now the Authority of the Lord's Supper is the same on both Sides; both our Author and his Adversaries allow, that it is of Divine Authority; that it was instituted by *Christ* himself; and therefore, according to the Opinions of them both, it is equally honourable and important, is equally worthy of Esteem, Reverence, and Value upon the Account of its Authority.

Let us next see, whether it is less beneficial to Men, according to the Notion of our Author, than according to that of his Adversaries. They both allow, that the Lord's Supper is a Means of conveying to Persons the Benefits of *Christ's* Death<sup>a</sup>; and that a Person who has lived in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, or, having sinned, has repented and actually amended his Life, is a Partaker of the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, when he receives the Lord's Supper<sup>b</sup>. But then our Author says, that a Person does not receive these Benefits by partaking of the Lord's Supper, at, and by the very Act of receiving it, any farther than as the Lord's Supper has a natural Tendency to continue him in the Possession of them, if he was in Possession of them before he came to, and received the Lord's Supper; or, if he is not already in Possession of them, to cause him to receive them, as far as he can re-

<sup>a</sup> See Page 463.

<sup>b</sup> 467.



# 434 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

ceive them in this World, and to cause him finally to become Partaker of them in the next World: whereas his Adversaries say, that he receives these Benefits, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper. Now, according to the Terms of the Gospel, if a Person has lived in a sincere Obedience to the Commands of *Christ*, or, having sinned, has repented and actually amended his Life, he is at that Instant a Partaker of all the Benefits of *Christ's* Death; and supposing he could receive them again by partaking of the Lord's Supper, yet what Benefit can it be to him to receive that, which he is already in Possession of? And our Adversaries do not pretend to say, that a Person can receive the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper, if he either has not lived in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, or, having sinned, has not repented and actually amended his Life. But I have shown, that it is impossible for a Person, who has lived in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, or, having sinned, has repented and actually amended his Life, to receive the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, at, and by the very Act of receiving the Lord's Supper; and also that a Person, who has not lived in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, cannot by any Means receive the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, without actual Amendment of Life. But supposing the Terms of the Gospel were such, as that tho' a Person lived in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, or, having sinned, had repented and actually amended

<sup>a</sup> See Page 450. and 468.

ed his Life; yet he could not receive the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, without partaking of the Lord's Supper, and his receiving them was deferred, until he received the Lord's Supper.

Yet it would not be more beneficial to Men to have the Terms of the Gospel such. For it would not be at all more beneficial to Men, to have the Lord's Supper made a Condition or Means of their receiving the Benefits of *Christ's* Death, *merely arbitrary*; as it would be according to the present Supposition. For, according to the Supposition of our Author, it is a Means of conveying the Benefits of *Christ's* Death to Persons, as it has a natural Tendency to cause them to become Partakers of them. Had it pleased God to have appointed the Lord's Supper to be a Condition or Means of Men's receiving the Benefits of the Gospel upon a *mere arbitrary* Account, they must indeed have submitted to it; but it could be of no Advantage to them to have it so appointed. They would not have less to do in order to their obtaining the Benefits of the Gospel. For, in order to it, they must still perform a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, or, if they have sinned, repent and actually amend their Lives. Neither would this become more easy to them. For the Lord's Supper, with regard to the *mere arbitrary* Account of its Appointment would give them no Help and Assistance towards their performing it.

And as the Lord's Supper appears to be of as high an Authority, and as beneficial to Mankind, according to what our Author teaches to be the Nature and End of it, as it does accord-

ing to what his Adversaries teach to be the Nature and End of it; so does it appear equally necessary for Men to come to and receive it. It is necessary for them to do so, as it is expressly commanded in the Gospel, and the Partaking of the Lord's Supper made thereby as much their Duty, and Part of the Conditions of their obtaining Salvation, as the Performance of any other Command. It is necessary, as it is a Means appointed by God towards their obtaining Salvation; which, from its Divine Appointment, may be concluded to be not only very useful and serviceable, but necessary to this End. For since God hath instituted the Lord's Supper on Purpose, and commanded it to be used by us, as a Means to preserve us in the Faith and Obedience of *Christ*; to neglect this Means is so to affront God, so to undervalue and despise his Wisdom, and Care of us, as is enough to provoke him wholly to withdraw the Assistance of his Holy Spirit from us, without which no Man can so believe in and obey *Christ*, as is sufficient to Salvation. Can we imagine, that God will at all assist him to believe in and obey *Christ*, who will not endeavour after it in that Manner, which he hath prescribed to him? And as it appears from its Divine Appointment, that the Lord's Supper is a necessary Means of so believing in and obeying *Christ*, as is sufficient to Salvation; so is it confirm'd by Experience, and none, who wilfully neglect this Means, can be found, who, besides their Transgression of this one Duty, live up to the Terms of the Gospel in other respects. But if they, who wholly absent themselves from this Ordinance, would examine their Lives and Actions, they



they would perceive, either that they did not believe in God and *Christ*, or that they were guilty of profane Swearing, or that they were Sabbath-Breakers, or Adulterers, or Fornicators, or Thieves, or Unjust, or Lyars, or Drunkards, or Uncharitable, or some Way or other wilful Transgressors of God's Law.

And according to what our Author has taught concerning the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper, Persons may the better see, how, and in what manner it confers Benefits upon them, better know how to exercise their Thoughts, that they may be benefited by it, and be better able to judge and perceive, whether they do receive Benefit from it or not. The Lord's Supper confers Benefit upon Persons, by leading and helping them to such Thoughts and Resolutions, as may produce or confirm in them that universal Righteousness, which alone can entitle them to the Promises of *Christ*. And it does this, as, by partaking of it worthily, according to the Nature and Design of it, Persons do particularly call *Christ* to their Remembrance, and actually exercise their Faith in him, as coming into the World, and suffering Death upon the Cross to redeem Mankind from the eternal Punishment of their Sins; profess themselves *Christ's* Disciples, and acknowledge their Obligation to live, according to his Laws, which will lead them to see the great Evil and Danger of Sin, the great Love of *Jesus* in dying to deliver them from it, if they comply with the Terms proposed by him, and the great Happiness he has promised to those who do so; and also to a serious Consideration of the Tenor and Design of his Holy Religion;

438 *A Defence of the Plain Account*

Religion; and beget in them such a Fear of suffering the eternal Punishment of Sin, if they continue in it, such Gratitude towards *Jesus* for dying for them, and such a Desire of obtaining the Happiness promised to those who obey him, as are most powerful Motives to move Persons to perform an universal Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*. These Thoughts the Remembrance of *Christ* naturally tends to beget in us; and to exercise their Thoughts in this Manner, and upon these Things should all Persons be carried by the Remembrance of *Christ*, that they may receive Benefit from the Lord's Supper. And if, when Persons receive the Lord's Supper, they are led on and assisted thereby to see the great Evil of Sin, and the Love of *Jesus* in delivering them from it, and perceive the many strong Motives and Encouragements to all Holiness of Conversation, which they there meet with; so as if they have before lived in a sincere Obedience to the Laws of *Christ*, to be preserved and confirmed in that Obedience; or if they have been Sinners, to become more in love with and more careful to perform their Duty, to have their pious Resolutions more established, the Tenderness and Sensibility of their Conscience encreased, and to be brought more under the Influence of the Doctrine and Precepts of Christianity in all their Actions; then do they receive Benefit from this Holy Ordinance.

Thus have I endeavoured to set forth, explain, and defend, what I apprehend to be the Sense of our Author, concerning the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper; and which, for the Reasons brought in Defence of it, appears to me to be

be the true Notion concerning it. Which Opinion, though I should in any Place have mistaken our Author's Meaning, those Reasons do equally support; and which when I see those Reasons clearly and fully confuted, I shall very willingly change for any other, which is by clearer and stronger Arguments proved and established.

F. I. N. S.



of the Lord's Supper. I should in any Place have mistaken our  
 Author's Meaning, those Readings do equally  
 support; and which when I see those Readings  
 clearly and fully explained, I am very willing  
 to change for any other, which is my clear and

# ERRATA.

Pag.	l.	r.	know, is
38	27		<i>Words of the Institution of</i>
65	31		<i>in in Spirit</i>
66	3		<i>their Persons</i>
72	10		<i>is, for it</i>
76	3		<i>Body and</i>
83	34		<i>Benefits purchased</i>
102	13		<i>drinking Wine</i>
106	20		<i>can, for cannot</i>
118			<i>Prop. 10, for Prop. 18.</i>
120	28		<i>Disciple, performs</i>
147	36		<i>what, for which</i>
217	28		<i>must be</i>
222	19		<i>Doctor says, he is</i>
229	1		<i>passing</i>
251	16		<i>to be</i>
253	13		<i>after Disciples put a Comma,</i>
253	34		<i>this, for his</i>
293	8		<i>is, for it</i>
307	20		<i>after Faith and Christ put a Comma,</i>
318	21		<i>" not speak of it. A fine Reason! O Accuser!"</i>